

**SENATE—Monday, June 11, 2001**

The Senate met at 1:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BILL NELSON, a Senator from the State of Florida.

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, who has made work in Government one of the highest callings and the formation of public policy a crucial ministry, we ask You to help us to bless the weekday and keep it holy. Give us a renewed sense of mission today as we go about the tasks of this week. You are present in this Chamber. May we keep our attention on You as the only one we must please. With that ever before us, we will work with excellence because we are accountable to You. So may every word we speak, every relationship we enjoy, and every task we tackle be done with a sense of Your presence. May we never forget why we are here: to serve You by being servant leaders to the people in our land. Living and working is a privilege. Thank You for another day to do both with enthusiasm. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Honorable BILL NELSON led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, June 11, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL NELSON, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. NELSON of Florida thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

**RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

**SCHEDULE**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are going to be in a period of morning business until 2:30 today. At 2:30 we are going to resume consideration of the education reform bill. We are going to spend 30 minutes on the Bond amendment regarding parental involvement and then 2 hours on the Landrieu amendment dealing with title I. We will have two rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m. in relation to the Landrieu and Bond amendments. We are going to complete consideration of this education bill by the end of this week.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now be in a period of morning business until the hour of 2:30 with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes with the following exceptions: Mr. THOMAS or his designee, 1:30 to 2; Mr. DURBIN or his designee, 2 to 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). The Senator from Florida.

**GLOBAL WARMING**

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to address a couple of topics that have been in my heart.

I had the privilege of being here Friday afternoon to hear Senator BYRD explain the legislation he was offering to try to get our arms around the problem of global warming. It was in Senator BYRD's presentation to the Senate that he shared with us that a vast majority of the scientific community in fact has recognized that the Earth's temperature is warming and that, indeed, man is contributing to that warming through the emission of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere, thus causing a greenhouse effect.

I was so moved by Senator BYRD's presentation, after which he then introduced the legislation, in light of the fact that this present administration had set aside the Kyoto accords and is going about in its own way to try to address the problem.

Senator BYRD offered this legislation, sponsored by himself and cosponsored by Senator STEVENS, as a means to try to accelerate and focus world attention on this phenomenon; to use Senator BYRD's words, that something out there in fact is happening.

I was moved to speak after Senator BYRD's presentation. What I shared was an experience of looking at global warming from the perspective of my past life as the elected insurance commissioner of Florida, recognizing that it would have devastating effects upon a State such as Florida with such an extensive coastline. The rise of the seas would have an immediate effect upon most of our population which is along the coast. The warming of the atmosphere would cause increased frequency and ferociousness of storms, particularly the storms that are a part of our life style in Florida known as hurricanes, and the rising temperature for the tropical and subtropical climes would likewise have the result of increasing pestilence and disease.

I was then moved to remember in my mind's eye the view I had out the window of the spacecraft *Columbia* on the 24th flight of the space shuttle, looking back at planet Earth, how beautiful it is and yet how fragile it looks. It is gorgeous. It is a blue and white ball suspended in the middle of nothing. Space is nothing. It is an airless vacuum that goes on and on for billions and billions of light years. In the midst of that void is this wonderful creation we call home, planet Earth.

I described to Senator BYRD Friday that on the first day, you are looking at nation states. On the second day, you are looking at continents. On the third day, you are looking at the whole planet. That is the perspective you have. The first time you look out, you are looking for home. You are looking for Florida, and then you are looking for America. Then in a few days you are looking for home, and there it is, planet Earth, blue because of the oceans, white because of the clouds.

If you look at the land mass, it is usually a dull brown except in parts where there are the contrasts of colors, such as the Horn of Africa, the bright, almost orange-reddish sands of eastern Africa set off against the bright blue waters of the Indian Ocean.

I am saying all of this because I wanted to add to the comments I made

on Friday about global warming. I was struck with the beauty of this creation, but I was also struck with how fragile it looked. I could see how we are not being good stewards. I could see the destruction of the rain forests, and then I could look to the east and see the mouth of the Amazon. The waters of the Atlantic were discolored for hundreds of miles with the silt that resulted from the destruction of the trees hundreds of miles upriver. I would look at the rim of the Earth, a bright blue band. But on closer inspection, you could see the thin film enveloping the Earth that sustains all of our life known as the atmosphere.

I came away from that experience of 6 days in outer space with a profound sense that I needed to be a better steward of what God has given us in this beautiful, colorful planet called Earth.

That is what I was moved to think of when Senator BYRD introduced his legislation concerning global warming; that we better be serious and listen to the scientific community, saying that things are changing, that people in States such as mine along the coast of this country had better be wary of the immediate effects upon them, the consequences of global warming, and that we should be better stewards of what we have been given by our creator, if, in fact, we are doing what we ought to do.

I have often let my imagination wander with regard to space travel. I firmly believe that in my lifetime, certainly in the lifetime of a lot of our young friends, we will see an international mission from planet Earth to another planet, probably Mars. When we get there, are those dry river beds that we see in our telescopes? And if they are, what happened to that water? And if we find, in fact, that there was water, then there likely was life. And if there was life, to what degree did it develop; was it civilized? And if it was civilized, what happened? What can we learn so that we can be better stewards of our civilization on planet Earth?

Senator BYRD, as he so eloquently expressed his concerns and interest and, therefore, the offering of the legislation to study the problem, was most timely. The President is on his way to Europe tonight to discuss this issue with the many leaders of Europe, their concern that he unilaterally disregarded the Kyoto accords. If we are not going to have the Kyoto accords for the nations of the world to come together to do something about the rise of the greenhouse effect on planet Earth, then we better get together with some other kind of protocol quickly. Senators BYRD and STEVENS are offering that kind of leadership as a way. It is just one suggestion, but it is an important suggestion. It is timely.

I took this moment to offer those thoughts and, again, to say my profound appreciation to the great Sen-

ator from the State of West Virginia for what he has offered.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. NELSON of Florida assumed the chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

## EDUCATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what has taken place in the Senate over the past few weeks, the change from a Republican majority to a Democrat majority, is really not about which party is in charge or which party is the majority. I believe the history books will be written that it is about the truly important issues to the citizens of Nevada, Florida, and citizens all over the country.

The education of our children, for example, is at the top of any list. Three of my grandchildren are of school age. As I stand here today, Mattie, Savannah, and Ryan are in school—one of them here in a suburb of Washington; two of them in Las Vegas. They are each sitting in their classrooms. They are so fortunate that they have great teachers. They have teachers who are dedicated to putting information in their heads and making them feel good about themselves.

As a grandfather, I want to do all I can to ensure that they receive the best education possible and that my other seven grandchildren—and I have two additional ones on the way, so that is 12 grandchildren—will also have the same opportunities and maybe even better opportunities than my 3 grandchildren who are in school today.

As a Senator representing the State of Nevada, I want to do everything I can as a Member of this national legislative body to make sure that not only my grandchildren but every child in America has an opportunity to be educated in the best way they can. We all have that obligation.

Millions of children across the country are, at this very moment, acquiring a foundation that will provide them with enormous opportunities. They are acquiring an education. There are also lots of children in America who are not being educated in the way they should be educated.

Nevada is an interesting example. We have one school district, Clark County School District, where Las Vegas is.

It is the sixth largest school district in America and fast approaching the fifth largest. There are 240,000 children in that school district. We have to build, to keep up with the growth, one new school every month. This year, we will dedicate about 15 schools. We hold the record in America. One year, we dedicated 18 new schools. The superintendent of schools has said he is not a superintendent of "instruction," but a superintendent of "construction."

We need help in this very large school district. We need help. There are

a number of ways we have tried to get aid to school districts for construction, not only to build new schools but to rehabilitate old schools.

The average school in the U.S. today is about 45 years old. We need to do better in helping large school districts such as Las Vegas. Also, we have schools in Nevada that are one-room schools. I went to school in a two-room school. There are schools in Nevada today that have one room, with five or six students. They also have to be part of what we are trying to do to improve education. Millions of children across the country may not realize it, but their parents and friends realize, and we realize, that there is nothing more important in their lives than to be educated.

So it is with fitting coincidence that the change in the leadership in the United States Senate occurs at the very time we are debating the education bill. Whether you are a Republican, or a Democrat, or an Independent, education is a nonpartisan issue. It should be a nonpartisan issue. If it is partisan, it is too bad. The education bill is an example of what Senators can accomplish when we work for the good of the country in a nonpartisan manner, joining together to ensure that every student has a chance to succeed. This bill is a true example of a nonpartisan success story. We hope it ends successfully this week. It began as the President's bill, was honestly and openly debated under Senator LOTT and the Republican majority, and now it will be completed under the leadership of Senator DASCHLE and the Democratic majority.

We all have to work together. I work together with my Republican colleague from Nevada, JOHN ENSIGN, in a way that I hope will serve as a model for the rest of this Chamber. In 1998, JOHN ENSIGN and I were involved in a historically close race. I won by 428 votes. People thought that JOHN ENSIGN—when Senator Bryan retired and he ran for the Senate—and I would be in a very bitter relationship here in the Senate. But we decided for our own well-being, for the well-being of the State of Nevada, and for this country, that we should join together and show people that Democrats and Republicans from States evenly divided as ours is—no matter how the State is divided—can work together to set an example. JOHN and I don't have to vote alike on everything, but we can work together so that we have a harmonious relationship. We are doing that. We are going to get better. We are pretty good now, but we are going to get better.

We have sent the President the judges that JOHN ENSIGN nominated, and I say "we" because I appreciate JOHN ENSIGN submitting those names to me. He has agreed to give me 25 percent of the judges we get in Nevada. I told him that is one more than I deserve. I appreciate that. It is an act of

generosity on his part and also an act that depicts our relationship. So the mere fact that people have bitter battles on this floor does not mean they can't work together tomorrow for the common good.

So I believe that from the 240,000 students in Clark County to the one-room schoolhouse in Nye County, all students deserve a quality education. We need to work together to finish this bill in a nonpartisan way for the children of Nevada. If we get in here in the next couple of days and there are difficult issues we have to resolve, we have to understand that we can take these issues by issue.

The overall responsibility we have is to come up with a good education bill. Now, I am personally disappointed that we are not going to have as much money as I think we should. We have to work with the tools we have, and we are going to do that. The education bill is legislation about which each Member of this Chamber should leave feeling good about. So it is my hope and that of Majority Leader DASCHLE that this legislation is the first of many written not by one party, but by Republicans and Democrats.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed using as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EDUCATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, later this afternoon we will turn to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I wish to take just a couple of minutes to talk about a couple of amendments to the education bill that I have offered with colleagues. These amendments have not yet been voted on but I expect both will be approved.

Education is very important. I am pleased it appears we will now finish this bill. This Congress has a responsibility to address the issue of education in a thoughtful way. We understand there are plenty of challenges in our educational system. We have schools that don't do as well as we would like. At the same time, I want to be sure to say there are a lot of wonderful schools in this country and a lot of great teachers who are educating our children.

More Americans have completed a high school education today than at any other time in history. At a time when we talk about the deficiencies in education, 84 percent of the American people are now completing a high school education. In France, only 52 percent of adults have a high school education. In the United Kingdom, 68 percent. In Japan, 70 percent.

With respect to virtually every aspect of life in this country, one can

take something and hold it to a light and say, isn't this ugly, and one can find a perfection that is ugly. But generally with respect to education, I ask this question: If public education in this country has not worked, how is it we have reached this position in our lives? The United States has done so much for so many over so long a period of time. The progress that has been made is remarkable.

I came to the Congress many years ago to initially serve in the House of Representatives. I have told my colleagues a story about going into the office of the oldest Member of the House at the time named Claude Pepper, a great public servant. He was then in his eighties, and his office was virtually a museum of posters and photographs. Two pictures in particular that were hanging behind his desk in his office stuck out to me. One was a picture of Orville and Wilbur Wright making the first airplane flight. It was autographed to Congressman Claude Pepper by Orville Wright before he died. It was autographed to Claude Pepper: With deep admiration, signed Orville Wright. Beneath that picture was a picture of Neil Armstrong stepping on the Moon, and it was autographed by Neil Armstrong to Congressman Claude Pepper.

I was struck by that. Here are two pictures: Of the first Americans to fly and then the first American to fly to the Moon. I thought about the relatively short timeframe that is represented by those pictures. What a breathtaking advance in technology and learning that allowed us to build aircraft that not only left the ground in airplanes that were primitive, but also flew all the way to the Moon for a lunar landing.

What is that about? It is about education. We achieved these advancements in America's classrooms. Those young scientists and engineers and mathematicians, the young talents all across this country, starting 1st grade someplace, went through high school, and went to college. They created progress in so many areas. Yes, in space, but also in medicine and so many areas this country has progressed.

Education is critically important. I wanted to say it at the front end. Those who somehow criticize our public educational system as a system that has failed America, in my judgment, are dreadfully wrong. This public system of education has empowered every young child in this country to be the best he or she can be. We have challenges, no doubt about it, and we should deal with those challenges.

I propose a couple of things to deal with some challenges. I propose we have school report cards. Every young person in school occasionally comes home with a report card; that child's school and the teachers evaluate how students are doing and they grade

them and give them a report card. Parents and taxpayers get no such report card that evaluates how the school is doing. What is their tax money buying? What is the level of achievement of that school? What kind of progress are those students making? How effective is this school at promoting learning among its students?

My proposal is to give parents a school report card that provides the opportunity to understand how a school is doing versus a neighboring school, how a school in this county is doing versus schools in another county, or how schools in this State compare to those in another State, so parents and taxpayers can hold a school accountable.

We need a school report card that is reasonably standardized across the country. Thirty-seven States have created school report cards, but there content varies widely and most parents have never ever seen one. I think we ought to be about the business of asking for report cards on the progress of our schools. I understand the report card language has been included as part of the underlying Manager's amendment, and I think that provision will represent some progress.

The second amendment I offer with my colleague, Senator ENZI from Wyoming, who will be here later today, is an amendment that talks about establishing technology academies in the public school system. I am not talking about setting up separate buildings. I am talking about providing some assistance to allow public schools that want to offer an in-depth curriculum in technology to do so. Those young students who are adept at technology and want to pursue technology-related careers can, through a technology academy curriculum, come out of that school system with a much stronger background and be able to fill some of the jobs that go wanting in this country.

Last year we had a debate about increasing the number of H-1B visas to meet our country's need for technology workers. Why do we need people coming into this country from other countries to perform that work? Because our schools are not producing the right kind of trained individuals in sufficient quantity to eliminate the need for the H-1B visas. So I supported those new visas. But it seems to me a smart thing for us to do is to strengthen the depth and breadth of the technology curriculum in those schools that want to do that. That allows those students who want to go into a technology job to be prepared for the future.

Technology, obviously, is very important. The increase in information technology and telecommunications, the breathtaking advances in those fields, are quite remarkable. I come from a State that is a rural State. In the past, we have always been far from markets

and therefore disadvantaged. But with information technology, with one click of a mouse, North Dakota is as close to the Hudson River as Manhattan. Distance is dead.

If distance is dead, opportunity is born, especially if you come from a rural State. And if that is the case, then let us develop technology academies through the incentive I would provide in this amendment with my colleague, Senator ENZI, to allow public schools to strengthen their curriculum in technology. Those students who want to move in that direction and fill those jobs that are now going unfilled ought to have that opportunity by coming out of our school system much better prepared to do so.

Those are two amendments I will be offering. My understanding is the first will be accepted as part of the underlying Manager's amendment, and the second will be adopted by a voice vote. I appreciate that. I think both of them will improve this bill.

Let me also say my colleague, Senator ENZI, will, I believe, come to the floor to speak about the technology academy amendment at some later point in the debate.

Finally, let me say this. Thomas Jefferson, in a famous quote, said about education:

Those who believe that a country can be both ignorant and free believe in that which never was and never can be.

Education is critical to the success of this country and its future. Education is just critical. It is the root of virtually everything else, the seedbed for progress in every other area. If we talk about defense, talk about social progress—everything we talk about has its roots in education. The issue of education is not complex. Education works when you have three elements: A teacher who understands how to teach, a student who wants to learn, and a parent involved in that student's education. When all those are present, education works, and works very well.

When it works well and where it works well, which is in many school districts across our country, I am enormously proud of what we are doing. I have sat in schoolrooms with dirt floors in the country of Haiti, for example, where a very small percentage of the children are getting educated in a very primitive way. I have sat in schoolrooms across the world in other countries, and wondered why these children will not have the opportunity they should have.

But I have also visited many classrooms in our country, and I would say from those experiences that I am enormously proud of what we have done. I am proud this country is the country that says every young child, regardless of origin, regardless of parentage, regardless of how much money they might have, is going to have an opportunity to be everything he or she can

be. That is the way our school system works. That is not true in some other countries. Some countries pare the children down very quickly and send them down different routes and different paths, saying to some, you are not eligible to be on the path going towards college, you are going to go somewhere else. That is not the way we do things in our country. In our country, every young child sees that flame of opportunity that beckons: You can do it.

I spoke at a college commencement ceremony this weekend with hundreds and hundreds of graduates. I looked out at those graduates who came from every corner, every conceivable background. Every single one who was announced was accompanied by a hoot, a howl, a hurrah, and a yeah from the audience because those families understood this is a big day and big achievement. So, too, is education success for our country. That is why I am pleased we are going to finish this bill and very pleased the two amendments I have offered will be included.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, we are in morning business until 2:30, so if he needs a few minutes after 2:30?

Mr. ALLARD. No, I just need 2 minutes now. I thought I might be encroaching on time set aside for the Democrats.

Mr. REID. You have, on your own, 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

#### THE COLORADO AVALANCHE BRING HOME THE CUP

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate the Colorado Avalanche for bringing the Stanley Cup back to Colorado. With a 3-1 victory in game 7 of the Stanley Cup Finals on Saturday night over the defending world champion New Jersey Devils, the Colorado Avalanche are champions once again. The Avalanche won their first cup in 1996 after arriving in Denver from Quebec.

The tough game seven victory capped an incredible season for the Avalanche. They won the President's Trophy which is awarded to the team with the most points at the end of the regular season. Captain Joe Sakic lead the way by having an MVP type season with 118 points and 54 goals. He scored another 13 goals in the playoffs to lead everyone in that category. With 52 wins in the regular season and securing home ice throughout the playoffs, the Ava-

lanche started their long march towards the cup.

After a first-round sweep of the Vancouver Canucks, the Avs faced the Los Angeles Kings which proved to be their toughest task aside from the finals. It took a 5-1 victory in game 7 of the Western Conference semi-finals to get to the Conference finals against the St. Louis Blues. With the scare of losing to Los Angeles behind them, the Avalanche came together in the Conference Finals and rolled over the St. Louis Blues in five games. The next hurdle would prove to be their toughest. The Colorado Avalanche had to face the defending champion New Jersey Devils to whom they had lost twice in the regular season.

Head Coach Bob Hartley had his Avalanche hitting on all cylinders in the first game of the Stanley Cup Finals and defeated the Devils 5-0. That would prove to be the only easy win in the entire series. The defending champion Devils defended their title well and the series was back and fourth the rest of the way until the game 7 win two weeks later. With Conn Smythe trophy winner Patrick Roy leading the way the Avs have brought the Stanley Cup back to the Rocky Mountains.

Roy, who won the Conn Smythe trophy, which is awarded to the most valuable player in the playoffs, is no stranger to awards. Roy won his first playoff MVP award 15 years ago, for the Montreal Canadiens. He became the first three-time winner of the award, and holds not only the all-time regular-season wins record, but his 212 playoff wins are tops as well. The great play of Roy and Sakic should not overshadow the play of the rest of the team, players like Alex Tanguay who scored the game winning goal on Saturday and Chris Drury who had the game winner of game 6 in New Jersey. Milan Hejduk had a great year and had 23 points in the playoffs, second only to Sakic. Rob Blake and Adam Foote did a tremendous job during the Avs quest for the cup as well. Up and down the roster for the Avalanche from Stephan Yelle to Eric Messier contributions were evident.

The team really came together when superstar Peter Forsberg had emergency surgery to remove a ruptured spleen after the game 7 victory over the Los Angeles Kings. Forsberg, who is considered by many to be the best all around player in the National Hockey League, had 14 points in 11 games before being sidelined for the Conference Finals and the Stanley Cup Finals. With Forsberg out, the team really stuck together and put forth quite an effort. The effort displayed on the ice was most evident by one player who waited 22 years to win a Stanley Cup.

Ray Bourque came to Colorado last year after playing his entire 20 year career in Boston for the Bruins in hopes of winning his first Stanley Cup. The 40

year old is one of the best defenseman to ever lace up the skates and he has a spot waiting for him in the Hall of Fame. The only thing eluding him during his illustrious career was Lord Stanley's Cup. Saturday night, I along with the rest of the country saw what pure joy feels like when number 77 hoisted the Cup above his head. After 1,826 games Ray Bourque can finally call himself a World Champion.

I congratulate Ray Bourque and the entire World Champion Colorado Avalanche organization on a sensational year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I recognize the members of the World Champion Colorado Avalanche of the National Hockey League and their outstanding Stanley Cup Finals victory this past weekend.

The Colorado Avalanche has proven the value of dedication, preparation and execution as they played through the regular hockey season, becoming the 2000-01 Presidents' Trophy winner, which is awarded annually to the NHL club that compiles the league's best regular season record, into the playoffs and in the Stanley Cup finals. As defenseman Ray Bourque declared in the playoffs this was Mission 16W, 16 wins to win the championship.

Most folks know how great of a team the Avalanche proved to be in winning its second cup in six seasons. In addition, the Colorado Avalanche players and the entire organization overcame injuries to key players and pulled together to win the championship. Their younger players, the next generation of all-stars for the Avalanche, also deserve additional praise for their contributions when they had to step up and take leadership roles. Great teams are measured by sustained success and the Colorado Avalanche has proven they are one of the premier teams in the NHL. For the second time since coming to Colorado in 1995, the Colorado Avalanche has won Lord Stanley's Cup. A total team effort was exemplified by the Colorado Avalanche this season.

Mr. President, I would also like to recognize several members of the Colorado Avalanche organization for their outstanding achievements during this past season. Specifically, Owner E. Stanley Kroenke, President and General Manager Pierre Lacroix and Head Coach Bob Hartley for their proven ability to assemble the necessary players and develop powerful lines that consistently provide victories for this franchise; Captain Joe Sakic, one of the best team leaders in the game today and a top scoring threat in the NHL; Goalie Patrick Roy, the anchor of the defense and the first player to win the Conn Smythe Trophy three times, which is awarded to the most valuable player of the playoffs; and defenseman Ray Bourque, whose 22 season quest for the cup is finally over.

These people are the most recognizable names in the Avalanche's organization and are major contributors to the team's success. But, the total team effort is what made the Avalanche victorious. The entire team worked together, went after and achieved a common goal. Each team member deserves to be recognized: Peter Forsberg, Dan Hinote, Steve Reinprecht, Stephane Yelle, Chris Dingman, Chris Drury, Eric Messier, Ville Nieminen, Alex Tanguay, Milan Hejduk, Scott Parker, Shjon Podein, Dave Reid, Rob Blake, Greg de Vries, Adam Foote, Jon Klemm, Bryan Muir, Nolan Pratt, Martin Skoula, David Aebischer, Jacques Cloutier, and Bryan Trottier.

The Avalanche's defense also proved they are in an elite class. When push came to shove, the defense only allowed 11 goals in the seven NHL final games against the New Jersey Devils, a team that is consistently one of the strongest teams in the league. Defense wins championships, and the Avalanche's defense proved this to be true.

It is a special honor for me to make this Senate floor statement to honor the Colorado Avalanche. Today I invite my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating the Colorado Avalanche in bringing Lord Stanley's Cup back to the Centennial State.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer attended the game.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows.

A bill (S. 1) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Pending:

Jeffords amendment No. 358, in the nature of a substitute.

Kennedy (for Dodd) amendment No. 382 (to amendment No. 358), to remove the 21st century community learning center program from the list of programs covered by performance agreements.

Biden amendment No. 386 (to amendment No. 358), to establish school-based partnerships between local law enforcement agencies and local school systems, by providing school resource officers who operate in and around elementary and secondary schools.

Leahy (for Hatch) amendment No. 424 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for the establishment of additional Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

Helms amendment No. 574 (to amendment No. 358), to prohibit the use of Federal funds

by any State or local educational agency or school that discriminates against the Boy Scouts of America in providing equal access to school premises or facilities.

Helms amendment No. 648 (to amendment No. 574), in the nature of a substitute.

Dorgan amendment No. 640 (to amendment No. 358), expressing the sense of the Senate that there should be established a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the rapidly increasing energy prices across the country and to determine what is causing the increases.

Hutchinson modified amendment No. 555 (to amendment No. 358), to express the sense of the Senate regarding the Department of Education program to promote access of Armed Forces recruiters to student directory information.

Bond modified amendment No. 476 (to amendment No. 358), to strengthen early childhood parent education programs.

Feinstein modified amendment No. 369 (to amendment No. 358), to specify the purposes for which funds provided under subpart 1 of part A of title I may be used.

Reed amendment No. 431 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for greater parental involvement.

Dodd/Biden further modified amendment No. 459 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for the comparability of educational services available to elementary and secondary students within States.

Clinton modified amendment No. 516 (to amendment No. 358), to provide for the conduct of a study concerning the health and learning impacts of sick and dilapidated public school buildings on children and to establish the Healthy and High Performance Schools Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Missouri is recognized to call up amendment No. 476 on which there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, could I take 1 minute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I think most people understand generally what the plans are. It will be, as I understand, approximately 30 minutes on the Bond amendment, after which we will be proceeding to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU. This afternoon, sometime after 5 o'clock, we will proceed to vote, as I understand it, on the Landrieu amendment, followed by the Bond amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I yield time as necessary to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 476

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the acting manager. I thank the Chair.

I want to talk about an amendment that I introduced some time ago and which we will vote on later this afternoon. The amendment itself is not very difficult and not very complex. It doesn't have a major change. But it

represents a watershed development in education. Parents for a long time have marveled at how fast their children learn when they are very young and how they pick up things—not just things off the floor but how they learn language and how they learn many other things.

Research has verified what all of us have known instinctively for a long time—that the first years of life are absolutely crucial in the development of a child's intelligence, habits, and the entire approach to life. The early years have a significant bearing on development and especially on the learning of each child. Infant brain development occurs very rapidly. The sensations and experiences of this time go a very long way towards shaping the baby's mind in a way that has a long-lasting impact on all aspects of the child's life.

You can think, if you have been a parent, or if you are parents, about how fast they learn in the first 3 years. A baby learns to walk, to talk, and to interact with others.

As a matter of fact, an astounding figure I heard was that half a child's mature intelligence is developed by 3 years of age. During those first 3 years that a child learns, it absorbs so much that it is half of what he or she is going to know for the rest of their life.

The early months of growth, understanding, reasoning, and learning can never be brought back or redone again. Once they are gone, they are gone. The early years of a child's development are not just rehearsal. That is the whole show. That is the opening act. That sets the stage and the pace of their entire life's path.

Parents and families are key to the early development of a child. Through the amendment that I offer today, we seek to focus on support of parents and family education for young children.

This amendment provides a clarification to title VI, part A of the substitute. It simply states that early childhood and early childhood parent education are eligible for funding and that early childhood means zero, or birth, to 5 years of age. The amendment is no new money, and it doesn't authorize any new program.

People think learning begins at kindergarten. By kindergarten children are halfway through their learning process in their entire life. Who best to teach that child in the first 3 formative years than the parents? We must focus on the early years of a child's life as well as on the years of formal schooling. We can emphasize and champion this early involvement.

My amendment proposes to do just that by supporting successful early childhood programs and initiatives that are working at local and State levels throughout this country.

We spend so much time talking about how to improve our public schools, which we must do, and this bill at-

tempts to do that. We talk about improving school performance for students, reducing violence in schools, and all of that we must do. But I think we can reduce the amount of time we spend trying to fix, repair, and cure these problems if we get the job done right at the first stage.

A key to this successful prevention is parental involvement at the time most essential in the child's development. The organization, which in my State of Missouri has been doing an outstanding job—and it is being done nationwide—is something called Parents as Teachers. I will refer to it as PAT.

It is an early childhood education program and family support program designed to empower all parents, regardless of their income levels, to give their child the best possible start in life. PAT is now in all 50 States and 6 foreign countries.

My involvement with Parents as Teachers began in 1979. Then commissioner of elementary and secondary education, Arthur Mallory, who worked for me the previous term when I had been Governor, came to talk to me about a very interesting and challenging program they had begun based on the work of some of the researchers and scholars who had looked at the Head Start Program. He said they were finding out that what a parent does in those first 3 years was vitally important as they stimulate the child's learning intelligence. Curiosity is the basis of it. That was 1979.

I started talking about that and ran a successful campaign for Governor in 1980. In 1981, our first son was born. You talk about an old dog trying to learn new tricks. I had just bought a new car, and they gave me a manual about that thick of what to do with the new car. We came home from the hospital with a new baby. They gave us a supply of diapers and told us to be sure to use a child's seat. I said that is a little bit mistaken as to the emphasis we ought to put on preparing children and making sure that parents are ready for the challenge of raising a child.

We had, fortunately, access to many initiatives that had been developed in this program. The program was not statewide at the time. It was, in fact, in the initial stages. The scholars, including Dr. Burton White, had written several thoughtful books. We read those books. We learned from them what was supposed to be happening. The interesting thing was it made it a lot easier for us to work with our son to understand what he was doing.

I recommended it to the Missouri General Assembly. They did not pass it in 1981. They didn't pass it in 1982. They did not pass it in 1983. But being stubborn, I came back in 1984, and we pointed out to them that this not only prepared the child for learning—my director of corrections came before the committee giving testimony on the bill

and said this was the most important thing we could do for the long-term future of our State: reduce the population of our corrections system by getting parents involved and making sure that children were off to a good learning start; making sure that parents were responsible for their children.

In 1982, I set up something called the Children's Trust Fund Commission to help reduce child abuse. We had 25 eminent children's leaders from the ministry, education, and health around the State who studied how to prevent child abuse. They came back in 1984 with the unanimous recommendation to adopt Parents as Teachers to help the families know how to deal with the challenges of raising a child.

I have always had a theory that if you have a toddler in your house, at some point if that toddler doesn't drive you absolutely nuts, either, A, the toddler is not normal, or, B, you are not normal. Parents as Teachers can teach how you can constructively use that curiosity, that enthusiasm, and that burgeoning intelligence and shift it in the right direction.

Fortunately, after a bit of cajoling, a little wheeling and dealing, and a few side deals that I will not mention here, the Missouri General Assembly adopted Parents as Teachers as the statewide program in 1984.

It has gone statewide. Each year it is a voluntary participation program, available in all 500-plus school districts in Missouri. And 150,000 families, with 200,000 children, participate in the program.

Now the program is working throughout the country. The State of Tennessee has 20 program sites, Massachusetts has 7 program sites, Nevada has 13 program sites, Mississippi has 32 program sites, South Dakota has 20 Parents as Teachers Program sites; our neighbors in Kansas have 222 program sites; Illinois has 132 program sites.

As I said, PAT is a voluntary participation program. It is tailored to empower parents to know how to deal constructively with their children. Sometimes it is included as part of Even Start, another title 1 program. PAT and Head Start in Missouri have a great partnership to ensure that all children get off to a great start.

Some said at the beginning, why, this is a good program for people on Medicaid or people on TANF, and other programs. And that is true. But it is a program that works for every family, the so-called "successful" family, with two working parents—two professionals, working full time, who never have enough time for their families. But with this program they know how to use that time constructively.

As a father, I never looked forward to playing the typical father role, which is where somebody says: If you don't behave, when your father gets home,

you're really going to get it. I did not intend to be a father so I could be the one to bring out the hairbrush. There was a paddle when I got home. But Parents as Teachers taught me what I could do constructively to help my child be more curious and begin the learning process.

Studies and reports have shown that PAT children at age 3 are significantly more advanced than the comparison children in language, problem solving, and social development. Often, through participation in PAT, learning problems or developmental delays or disabilities are identified and treated early.

This is one of the great things. They have screening in the program, and they identify minor hearing defects which can, if not corrected, put a child behind as much as a year by the time that child reaches first grade.

I had an eyesight problem when I was little. It wasn't identified until I was in the sixth grade. It was too late to help it then. Each year the program has been in effect, they have identified that eye problem; they have been able to correct it because they identified it before the child reached 2 years of age.

Some people, when opposing Parents as Teachers, say it is subversive; that the Government is trying to come in and take over the children. The Government is not trying to come in and take over the children. But there is a subversive element that I have learned; that is, once you teach a parent how to do a better job with the child's learning intelligence, you get that parent hooked on the child's education. A parent goes in thinking: Gee, this will help me control my child. The parent comes out being involved, supporting and participating in the child's education. And most people will tell you that the most important thing a parent can do is to stay involved with the child's education.

We all know we can have all the programs in the world and can provide all the funding possible, but one of the main ingredients on which we must focus to assure a child's success in school is parental involvement.

Earlier this year I received a copy of a report from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The report was entitled "School Entry Assessment Project." Some of the findings really piqued my interest.

The findings of the report are as follows:

No. 1, when Parents as Teachers is combined with any other prekindergarten experience for high-poverty children, the children score above average on all scales when they enter kindergarten.

No. 2, the highest performing children participate in PAT and preschool or center care. Among children who participate in PAT and attend pre-

school, both minority and nonminority children score above average. Children in both high-poverty and low-poverty schools who participate in PAT and attend preschool score above average when they enter kindergarten.

No. 3, among children whose care and education are solely home-based, those whose families participate in PAT score significantly higher.

No. 4, special needs children who participate in PAT and preschool, in addition to an early childhood special education program, are rated by teachers as being similar in preparation to the average child.

Finally, Head Start children who also participate in PAT and other preschool activities score at average or above when they enter kindergarten.

These findings sum it all up. PAT works. PAT works for children raised in households of all income levels. PAT works for children who are homeschooled, children who have special needs.

My amendment, which I urge my colleagues to support, makes certain that priority is given to programs such as PAT and other early childhood and parent education programs.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen seconds.

Mr. FRIST. Thirteen seconds. I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak in favor of the amendment for about 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from Tennessee withhold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. If the Senator from Tennessee needs part of our time, he is welcome to 8 minutes of it. Senator KENNEDY has approved that.

Mr. FRIST. That will be fine. I will proceed under the time from the other side of the aisle, and we will be able to stay on schedule, I think, for our next amendment that is coming up in about 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment put forward by the Senator from Missouri. I think it concentrates on two important areas, and both of them include involving parents in the education of their children.

It really concentrates, at least to my mind, on two points. No. 1, nobody really cares more about a child than the parents of that child. When we talk about local control and big government, where decisions should be made,

and educational choice, I think the people who care the most should be most involved in making the decisions and in participating in the child's education. That is what this amendment does. It shines that spotlight as local as you can go: on the child and parental involvement.

No. 2, the amendment, again, shines an important spotlight on the science of education. Medical science in some ways reveals how people learn: how children learn, how adults learn. As the Senator from Missouri has outlined so well, the early development of the brain, as we have recently discovered, is an important factor in determining how we learn in grades 1-3, grades 3-8, and, in truth, how we learn the rest of our lives.

So I think, very appropriately, the amendment points that spotlight on those two things: No. 1, parents care the most about their child and therefore should be involved, and, No. 2, it takes into account the fact that we know more about how people learn from a scientific physiologic anatomic standpoint than we did before.

The amendment of the Senator from Missouri looks at an underlying part of the BEST bill, the bill that sits on each Member's desk. This bill already contains an important section on parental involvement. However, this amendment brings greater focus on parental involvement.

There are basically two changes. First of all, it does not involve new money. It does not involve the authorization of a new program. It addresses title VI, part A, as the Senator said, for those people who would like to actually look at the underlying bill. It says, funds provided under this section can be used for early education and for encouraging greater parental involvement through the Parent's as Teachers Program or other early childhood parent education programs. The Senator from Missouri is the father of the Parent's as Teachers Program which has been enacted in all 50 States; as he said, 20 such programs exist in Tennessee; it has a proven track record.

A very important part of the amendment is the science of education. Though some regard this aspect as technical, I believe it is an important clarification. The language is changed so instead of simply stating that parents of preschool-aged children should be involved, the language is changed to include parents of children from birth through the age of 5.

This is important because, when referring to preschool-aged children, most people and much of the literature which is written on this subject focus on children who are 3 to 5 years of age. The Bond amendment extends the definition of preschool-aged to the birth of the child.



This is very important because we now know from recent scientific findings the importance of early brain development through educational experiences and involvement during the early years. I personally, as a physician and scientist, appreciate that.

Further, the Bond amendment allows at least half of the funds provided for part A to be used for the Parents as Teachers or other early childhood parent education programs. The Parents as Teachers program is used in all 50 States and has a proven track record. Let's focus on that program and invest in that program, but also recognize that it alone isn't the answer. As we learn more, other programs will come along. This amendment allows up to 50 percent of the money to be used in those other programs as well.

I applaud the Senator from Missouri for granting states flexibility in implementing these programs. We should not assume that we have all the answers in the programs we have supported. Let's give State and local schools the flexibility they need to meet their individual needs.

To put it all in perspective, the Census Bureau in 1995 told us there were 14.4 million children under the age of 5 who were in some kind of child care arrangement program. Between 1991 and 1999, the percentage of 4-year-olds enrolled in some kind of pre-primary, either center-based or kindergarten, education program increased from 60 percent up to 90 percent. For 3-year-olds, participation rates between 1991 and 1999 were relatively unchanged. Clearly there is a lot of work to do.

At the same time—again, the Senator from Missouri spelled this out for us—the data indicates that some children need more assistance to get ready to learn when they enter kindergarten than is presently being provided today.

As we go forward and look at the whole education arena from the year 2001 forward, we must be forward-thinking and focus on the problems of early childhood education and development.

In closing, President Bush's Early Reading First Program, which intends to leave no child behind, focuses on this same concept. Children must be taught pre-reading skills and pre-math skills during the entire preschool period so they will be ready for reading and mathematics. Again, this is all centered on preparing people how to learn.

The President's Early Reading First Program, now part of this bill, S. 1, permits States to receive funding to implement research-based reading programs in existing preschool programs and Head Start Programs that feed into participating elementary schools.

I commend the Senator from Missouri for introducing this amendment. It expands and improves our underlying early education programs. It

takes the initiative put forth on early learning by the President of the United States and improves it.

The amendment itself is not a new program and will not require new funds. It clarifies that early childhood and early childhood parent education is important and needs to be emphasized even more in title VI, part A of this bill.

I look forward to supporting the amendment which will be voted on later this afternoon, sometime after 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if my two friends will remain on the floor for a unanimous consent request, I have checked with both managers of the bill, Senator KENNEDY and Senator FRIST. We would like to reverse the order of the votes this afternoon. The way the unanimous consent agreement is written, it provides for the Bond vote being second. We would like to have the Bond vote first and Senator LANDRIEU second.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I would be honored.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, are we going to try to do the vote at 5:15? Are we going to stick with that?

Mr. REID. Give or take a few minutes.

Mr. President, I make that unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield for a unanimous consent request—not a unanimous consent—we just want to make sure that all the time on the Bond amendment has been yielded back. We had time remaining so it is now yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. REID. We yield that back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is yielded back. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN and Mr. REID are located in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. BINGAMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we will in a moment have an opportunity to listen to the Senator from Louisiana on a very important amendment, but I want to add my voice of support for Senator BOND's amendment, the Parents as Teachers Program, to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

One of the things we have tried to do in this legislation is encourage efforts that are taking place locally that have demonstrated success. Parents as Teachers has been an enormous success in my State of Massachusetts. I was not here when Senator BOND commented favorably about the programs in Massachusetts. I am grateful for his recognition of those programs. I underline to my colleagues how valuable and important these programs are and what a difference they make to so many children in this country.

We have 20 programs in Massachusetts, as Senator BOND has mentioned, and they provide training and support to new mothers. We need to take advantage of the potential for learning during a child's early years, whether it is part of Head Start or a stand-alone program. This program gives families the support they need to help the children meet their true potential.

As we have seen in the most recent studies by the Academy of Sciences this last year about a child's development in the very early years, this is a time of enormous potential, encouraging development of the brain and also character that will suit them in academic achievements.

The Carnegie Commission studies in this area are enormously powerful and persuasive, the basis of some of the work that has been done to encourage Congress to support the early learning programs which were adopted last year. We have seen the results in support of the Head Start Program. It only spends a small fraction of its money on this kind of support, but there have been very important results.

The Early Start Program, which is the first 3 years of Head Start, only has about 10 or 12 percent of the total Head Start Program funding. Again, it is very limited. Nonetheless, the benefits that come from it are profound. This program is one I am hopeful can be replicated not only in my State but around the country because it has a very dramatic impact on the children and has a very positive impact on the parents as well. It well deserves our support and inclusion in the bill.

As has been pointed out by my colleague and friend, Senator Frist, this is not a new program; it is one that has



been out there working and has very broad support. We encourage it. We hope other communities will take advantage of it and that the children will be the beneficiaries.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 475 TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be set aside. Under the previous order, the Senator from Louisiana is recognized to call up amendment No. 475 on which there shall be 2 hours of debate equally divided.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, is the amendment at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU] proposes an amendment numbered 475 to amendment No. 358.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure adequate funding for targeted grants to local educational agencies under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965)

At the end of part A of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 120D. ADEQUACY OF FUNDING OF TARGETED GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES IN FISCAL YEARS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2001.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The current Basic Grant Formula for the distribution of funds under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.), often does not provide funds for the economically disadvantaged students for which such funds are targeted.

(2) Any school district in which at least two percent of the students live below the poverty level qualifies for funding under the Basic Grant Formula. As a result, 9 out of every 10 school districts in the country receive some form of aid under the Formula.

(3) Fifty-eight percent of all schools receive at least some funding under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, including many suburban schools with predominantly well-off students.

(4) One out of every 5 schools with concentrations of poor students between 50 and 75 percent receive no funding at all under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(5) In passing the Improving America's Schools Act in 1994, Congress declared that grants under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 would more sharply target high poverty schools by using the Targeted Grant Formula, but annual appropriation Acts have prevented the use of that Formula.

(6) The advantage of the Targeted Grant Formula over other funding formulas under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is that the Targeted Grant Formula provides increased grants per poor child as the percentage of economically disadvantaged children in a school district increases.

(7) Studies have found that the poverty of a child's family is much more likely to be as-

sociated with educational disadvantage if the family lives in an area with large concentrations of poor families.

(8) States with large populations of high poverty students would receive significantly more funding if more funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were allocated through the Targeted Grant Formula.

(9) Congress has an obligation to allocate funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 so that such funds will positively affect the largest number of economically disadvantaged students.

(b) LIMITATION ON ALLOCATION OF TITLE I FUNDS CONTINGENT ON ADEQUATE FUNDING OF TARGETED GRANTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount allocated in any fiscal year after fiscal year 2001 for programs and activities under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) may not exceed the amount allocated in fiscal year 2001 for such programs and activities unless the amount available for targeted grants to local educational agencies under section 1125 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 6335) in the applicable fiscal year is sufficient to meet the purposes of grants under that section.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge before I begin the fine work my colleague from Massachusetts has done on this bill and on education in general. His leadership in this area has been extraordinary and breathtaking in terms of the energy and enthusiasm he puts forward year after year on this issue.

I join with him in thanking our colleague, Senator BOND, for offering his amendment that will help to provide some of the resources for early childhood education. I also join with Senator KENNEDY in suggesting it would be a very wise expenditure of our dollars to move them at the very early end when children are so impressionable, young children, particularly between the ages of 0-3, helping them to come into this world healthy, helping their parents or their one parent to be as responsible, caring, loving, and nurturing as possible so that family unit gets off to a very good start.

As a parent—and you know this as a parent, Mr. President—I believe all parents want to be good parents. I really believe that. I believe all of us have an innate sense of wanting to do the best for our children. But some adults who have not had a good example in their own parents or some adults who have suffered abuse and gross neglect themselves, some adults who have been oppressed and have very low self-esteem have a very difficult time trying to be that responsible parent.

With these early childhood initiatives so we can perhaps reach out through our elementary and secondary bill, as well as other efforts in this Congress, I believe we can identify some wonderful community-based, statewide national organizations that are sprouting up everywhere recognizing this and for the Federal Government to be a real partner.

In my State, we have created Steps to Success which is the first statewide

effort but community based, community built but networked, working with hospitals and other agencies in the private sector in Louisiana and, as Senator KENNEDY has mentioned, in Massachusetts. While this is not the topic of my short remarks on the floor today, I lend my support to this area of early childhood education and thank the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. FRIST, for his remarks.

I come to the floor today to offer an amendment related to title I, that has to do not with spending more money, necessarily, but spending the money we are already spending better—spending whatever new money we can negotiate in this new approach, this new accountability system, this new system of real consequences for students and their families, teachers, and the schools that fail to meet the new accountability standards for whatever that new money is, to target it so we hit our target, so we hit a bull's eye.

We have been spending money for education at the Federal level for over 30 years. We have been spending, in some people's minds, a lot of money. We have been creating program after program after program for 35 years. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many who offer this amendment today, including Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator DEWINE, Senator BAYH, Senator CARPER, and many others, we have not targeted this money well enough to meet the challenges of yesterday, today, and most certainly not of tomorrow.

What do I mean by that? It is as if we shot our quiver of arrows, we continue to shoot arrows, but we are not hitting the bull's eye; we are not hitting the target. That target, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, based on the initial concepts of Federal aid to education, is to use our resources—which represent only about 7 percent of the total dollars spent for elementary and secondary education—to reach the students who need the most help. Who are those students? Those students are from poor areas or students in poverty themselves, students who find themselves in schools with high concentrations of poor students.

This is where the Federal resources should be directed. I am sad to report to all of my colleagues, this is not where our resources are going. In fact, there was a startling and wonderfully written article called "How the U.S. Tax Code Worsens the Education Gap." I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

HOW THE U.S. TAX CODE WORSENS THE EDUCATION GAP

(By Richard Rothstein)

Congress will soon debate the government's biggest education program, Title I, which has origins in President Lyndon B.

Johnson's war on poverty and sends nearly \$9 billion a year to schools with low-income children.

While some dismiss Title I as a failure, no one disputes its intent to aid needy children. Yet few recognize that over all, the federal government exacerbates inequality in education, giving more money to districts with affluent children than to those with poor ones.

It does so with a tax system that subsidizes school spending in home-owning communities, many of them upper middle class or even wealthy. Homeowners who itemize deductions reduce their federal income taxes by a portion of their property tax payments. A family in the 28 percent bracket that pays \$1,000 in local property taxes for public schools can deduct that payment on its income tax returns. Of the \$1,000 going to schools, the family pays only \$720 out of its earnings. The federal government contributes the \$280 balance.

Economists term these subsidies "tax expenditures," because they have the same effect as direct government spending. Yet the federal education budget highlights only direct outlays, perhaps because tax expenditures would be politically indefensible if widely publicized.

The property tax subsidy aids affluent families more than lower-income ones. It helps only those who itemize deductions, and itemizers have higher incomes on average than taxpayers who take the standard deduction. Nearly all families with annual incomes of \$100,000 itemize, as against fewer than a third of families with incomes of \$35,000.

And because the subsidy is tied to a family's tax bracket, even among itemizers the subsidy grows as income rises. Families in the 28 percent bracket get a \$280 subsidy for each \$1,000 in property taxes, but those in the 15 percent bracket get only \$150.

Dr. Susanna Loeb, a Stanford University economist, notes that this system spurs school spending in wealthy communities, both in total dollars and relative to spending in less wealthy districts. When larger shares of property taxes are under-written by the federal government, families become more willing to raise levies for better schools. Districts in wealthier communities can raise property taxes more easily, knowing that Washington picks up more of the tab.

There are some offsetting factors. One is the alternative minimum tax, paid by those who claim so many tax breaks that they would otherwise pay little or nothing in income taxes; this effectively reduces the property tax subsidy. On the other hand, many other, less affluent taxpayers do not itemize deductions at all, mostly out of ignorance. A community's schools get no benefit if its residents are lower-middle-income homeowners who take the standard deduction instead of itemizing.

Another countervailing factor is state income taxes, also deductible on federal forms. If a state uses its income tax revenue to equalize school spending, the federal system helps it do so. But this effect is limited. A homogeneous affluent community can more easily respond to federal tax incentives by voting to increase its property levy than a state as a whole can respond by increasing its income tax rates.

On balance, direct federal education outlays are mostly for poor children, while indirect spending mostly benefits the affluent. And federal tax expenditures for schools exceed direct spending.

Dr. Loeb has calculated federal per-student education spending for 1989. (Calculations for

recent years must await data from the 2000 census.) She found that federally stimulated inequality occurs both among and within states.

In New Jersey, federal tax expenditures were \$1,257 per student, but direct spending was only \$237. In Alabama, tax expenditures were \$165, while direct spending was \$371.

Among districts within states, the differences were just as stark. Because tax expenditures are so high in wealthier districts, Princeton, N.J., got \$2,399 in total per-student federal aid. But Camden, despite high Title I grants, got only \$1,140.

Other tax expenditures increase inequality further. For example, the mortgage interest deduction also subsidizes homeowners' costs, lifting property values. This, in turn, disproportionately adds to the income of wealthy school districts, because tax rates are a percentage of assessments.

Politically, it is hard to imagine that either Democrats or Republicans will meddle with these upper-middle-class tax benefits, or appropriate enough Title I aid to outweigh them. But there is something perverse about both parties' proclaiming that they wish to leave no child behind, when the federal government plays so big a role in pushing affluent children farther ahead.

Ms. LANDRIEU. The author is supporting my point but with a different approach. He is saying not only, basically, are Senator LANDRIEU and others right to say that title I is underfunded—and I am paraphrasing—but we are also not giving as much direct aid to poor students as to more affluent students. To make the matter even worse, the Tax Code itself, which is indirect aid, helps to underwrite education in more affluent, middle-income districts throughout Louisiana, Texas, California, and throughout our Nation. The combination of not getting the title I money to the poorest districts, together with the Tax Code that subsidizes home ownership to a degree proportionately greater in more affluent neighborhoods, is a combination of giving Federal resources to middle-income, affluent students, which is fine, but we are not reaching the poor students, and we should reach them first. With what is left over, in addition, we can reach more middle-income and affluent students.

I think the Federal Government should try to help all students. We want every school to be excellent. We want every child to have an opportunity to enjoy a technology lab, a science lab, a math lab. We want to be in partnership with the affluent districts, with middle-income districts, but we must be in partnership with poor districts. They are short on partners. Those children are short in their future. Their dreams are cut short. We have to meet them more than halfway and then do our very best to be partners with our other districts. We can do that. We can adopt this amendment which will help target the funding to these poor students.

Let me show "A Tale of Two Schools." I will give some specific information for the RECORD. We picked a

couple of States for this discussion. People might be interested to hear about Mississippi, or Pennsylvania, California as one of our largest States, and then, of course, Louisiana. I begin with Mississippi.

Before I get into the specifics, 35 years ago, in 1965, President Johnson created title I for this express purpose. He said when he created this program: "By helping some, we will increase the prosperity of all." President Johnson put forward that providing a quality education for every child, regardless of whether they were a child in poverty, a child in a difficult situation, was not only the right thing to do, not only the fair thing to do, but it was the smart thing to do for our Nation.

If we are a nation blessed with natural resources, clearly the greatest resource is our own people. That is even more true today than it was in the agricultural age or the industrial age. Today, as we build a society based on intelligence and skill and comprehension, building those skills inside of each human and developing them is more important to help strengthen our economy. Any businessperson in this Nation—whether with the Chamber of Commerce or the Business Council, which have been supportive in many of these areas—will say that. President Johnson had this idea 35 years ago.

He went on to say that "in the future, as in the past, this investment will return its costs manyfold to our entire economy." He was right.

What we have done from that initial "birthing" of this idea is we have allowed this child, this teenager of ours, "title I," to go off in a different direction than we first intended. We need to pull this back and get back to its basics, as it was created 35 years ago. Let me explain why.

Taking "A Tale of Two Schools," in Mississippi, Taconi Elementary School in Ocean Springs, the poverty rate in Ocean Springs is 27 percent. They are receiving \$546 per title I child. However, across the State of Mississippi, in Jackson, there is a school, Brown Elementary, with a poverty rate of 99.5 percent for children. In this school, there are only a handful of households with parents working. These are parents who were working because we have welfare reform. People work at minimum wage jobs, but 100 percent of these children have households with a parent or parents bringing in less than \$13,000 a year. Because we are not funding our targeted grantees, each child doesn't receive \$546; they receive \$268. The children who need the most help are getting less money in Jackson.

The principal to whom we spoke yesterday, Hazel Shield, when we told her of this situation, said: That is ridiculous. We are talking about my kids who need the most attention.

She says her top priority for the funds is reading and math supplies, but

she said: We run out of paper, pencils, and their parents don't have them, crayons, just the basic tools.

I suggest if we expect all our students at Brown Elementary School to master this new test that this underlying bill is requiring, to be able to compete in math and English and language, to be able to be computer literate, they are going to need more than crayons. They are going to need more than pieces of paper and pencils and crayons. Mr. President, \$268 is not going to do it.

Let's go to Pennsylvania. This is two schools in Pennsylvania. I know our Senators from Pennsylvania, Mr. SANTORUM and Mr. SPECTER, will be very familiar with these schools. No doubt both of those Senators who worked so hard in education have visited these or other schools similar to them. Rolling Hills Elementary only has 3 percent poverty. It is in Holland County. It is a very wealthy district. You can see, \$2,361 is received for each child under the poverty level in Holland. But in Aliquippa Middle School in Aliquippa County, where the poverty rate is 85 percent, these children who need the most help are only receiving from the Federal Government \$878 per child.

These children in Aliquippa need help; they need a partner; and the Federal Government must be their partner. They do not have a tax base as Holland does. They don't have Fortune 500 companies in Aliquippa, as perhaps Holland does, there or close by. If they do not have the Federal Government as their partner, they do not have a partner, and these children will fail, not because they are not talented, not because they are not smart, not because their parents don't love them, not because they do not try but because they simply do not have the resources to compete. It is a shame and we need to fix it.

Let's now go to California, which is one of our largest States. I thought it would be interesting, since most everybody knows where Beverly Hills is, to show the Beverly Hills situation which, of course, includes Beverly Vista, a wonderful school where the poverty rate is only 10 percent. This is a fairly well off community. Many people have seen Beverly Hills on television or visited there. We send to each of these children in Beverly Hills \$1,100.

But on a little different side of Los Angeles, which is a big city, there is a little school called Sixth Avenue Elementary where the poverty rate is 100 percent. There is not one child in this school whose family earns a little more than \$20,000—I am just assuming it is a little higher than it would be in Mississippi. But if anybody has tried to live in Los Angeles on \$18,000 a year for a household income, that is very hard. It is hard to live on that anywhere but particularly in a big city. We help

these children with \$270. We help them but we do not help them enough.

We spoke to the principal and a teacher there at Sixth Avenue Elementary. The principal says her greatest need is teacher development. At this school, Sixth Avenue Elementary, 66 percent of the staff is not certified. In our bill, if I am not mistaken, there is either an amendment on the bill or there is going to be an amendment adopted which is going to say schools with 50 percent of teachers who are not certified have 3 years to get them certified.

At \$270 a child, I, for the life of me, do not know, even with the greatest principal in the world and the most active parent association possible, how they, in Sixth Avenue Elementary, are going to reach that goal when we are only helping them at \$270 per child.

The average fourth grade student at Sixth Avenue Elementary is reading at the third or below third grade level, and the pupil-teacher ratio in fourth and fifth grades is 35 to 1.

Let me repeat, the fourth and fifth grade students are now reading below the third grade level, and the pupil-teacher ratio is 35 to 1. We are contributing \$270 per student to help them pass these new tests that they are now going to have to take every year, which I support—new accountability standards which I have supported. The cosponsors of this amendment have been some of the strongest on the floor for accountability. But if we do not step up to the plate on this, if we do not target our resources, we are setting our children up for failure.

As a mother of two children, I hate to see my own children fail. But I realize some failure is part of life and you cannot be successful without some failure. But my children wake up every day knowing they will succeed because I tell them so. I don't set them up for failure. I don't put them in places where they will be consistently failing. I give my children opportunities to succeed even in the small things because I want to build them into a sense of accomplishment, a sense of well-being, a sense that they can do it.

What in heavens name are we doing if we set up our children in this Nation so they can fail and fail and fail and then say it is their fault. They are not living up to their responsibilities when we are not living up to our responsibilities—at \$270.

Two people who go out to eat in LA—I know because I have been there—at one restaurant one night could spend \$270 on a meal. But that is all we do at Sixth Avenue Elementary in Los Angeles to help these children for a year of learning. It is, in my estimation, a crime and a travesty.

Let me talk a minute about Louisiana. I see my colleague, Senator DEWINE. I am going to try to wrap up in about 10 minutes because I know he

is here to speak. But let me go through three examples at Capdau Middle School in New Orleans, right in my hometown. I want to show you some pictures. We did not go out of our way to find the worst pictures. They couldn't get much worse than this. But we thought this was an interesting picture because on the front—I don't know if the camera can pick it up—it says: "You are about to enter a learning zone."

The artist had to airbrush off the graffiti that was here because it was not appropriate to show on the camera. So after we polish up this picture, it still doesn't look very good. This is the learning zone—a very attractive entrance, as you can see. I am being sarcastic here. It is not a very attractive entrance for children to walk into in the morning.

If a child got thirsty somewhere out in the playground, I don't think they would be very interested in drinking the water that would come out of this faucet, if water could come out of it. We have seen many comparable slides on the need for school construction. It is not only spending more money but also managing our schools well so the maintenance keeps up. I venture to say you cannot just pour in money and solve these problems. It has to be a maintenance effort and good management of the schools.

I want to show you what the school looks like so you can get the sense that this school has an 83-percent poverty rate. But the unbelievable thing I want to share with you is that this school in New Orleans doesn't get any title I money. At least the Sixth Avenue Elementary School in Los Angeles got \$278. Why? Because we don't fund the targeted grants at all and never have. They are in the law but they are not funded.

The amount of money in title I is not enough to reach all poor children. Even in New Orleans, the school with 83 percent of the children in poverty is not receiving one dollar of title I money. And the principal says they need basic supplies and textbooks. There is simply not enough to go around. Half the staff is not certified. This is one of the low-performing schools in our parish.

We are in an accountability system right now. Louisiana has adopted one of the leading accountability systems in the Nation. Despite the fact these children have no water to drink on the playground, despite the fact they don't have enough textbooks, despite the fact they have to walk every day into this place that is called a learning zone—it surely doesn't look like one—these kids are doing better on their tests. Why? Because they want to succeed. Why? Because their parents want a better life for them. They are doing their best. They are not where they need to be. If I were in a school such as this, I might not be where I needed to be either. But we can do better.

Let me show you Johnson Elementary School. Johnson Elementary School in Lake Charles was forced to cut its summer program to just 3 weeks. Three percent of the students are at the poverty rate. Last summer I think they were able to provide 6 weeks of summer school to the children who were behind so they could catch up and so they would have a safe place to play in those hot summer months.

Lake Charles, unfortunately, with this hurricane, is having a lot of problems, as in southwest Louisiana. This school, in addition to these pressing and chronic problems, may be in a flood zone at this moment. There may not be any summer school, but if there is, they will just have enough money for 3 weeks.

At Greenlawn Terrace Elementary in Jefferson Parish, there are 33 students for each teacher in the fourth and fifth grades. The ratio is 1 to 33. The principal says, obviously, these students need more individual attention. It is hard to teach a fourth grader and fifth grader. It is not the easiest grade to teach. The students are at a very interesting age, shall we say, at a time I think in their life where they need extra special attention. These are 10-, 11-, and 12-year-olds at this particular age in the fourth and fifth grade. That school does not receive any title I.

Finally, at Scotlandville Middle School in Baton Rouge, our capital city, 68 percent of eighth graders fail to pass the math portions of their statewide exams. People would say: Why? How could 68 percent of the students fail their exams? One of the reasons is the school has a math lab and it is fully equipped, but they don't have enough money to hire a teacher to teach the math class. They have the laboratory; they have the best software; they have the computers; but because they do not have the extra title I money, they do not have the instructor. So it sits empty, and 68 percent of eighth graders have failed their math portion.

Let me share with you some successes. Despite the fact we have not targeted our money, despite the fact we have never allocated enough money, there are some successes with title I. That is the point of my message. This is an amendment with hope. This is a story that could have a happy ending. This is an exercise where if we did what we could we could most certainly hit that target. When we hit it, it would make a big difference for these children.

In Baton Rouge, they were able to use the title I dollars they received last year to hire one additional teacher. They took their third grade class size down from a ratio of 32 to 1 to 21 to 1. Now you are talking; now kids are learning; now there is teaching going on, and students will be able to meet these high standards we have set for them.

When a school that we contacted in Lake Charles used their title I funds, they extended their schoolday. They went to a year-round learning program. The students in that school, within just a short period of time—I think less than 1 year—showed clear and drastic improvement on their State tests.

The great thing about funding title I is that it is in some way the perfect block grant. The locals have total flexibility as to how they would like to spend it. It is tied to student achievement. Senator FEINSTEIN has an amendment on this subject to tie title I to student achievement so the locals can decide if they want to have after-school care, learning, and extended days. How about Saturday school for some kids who would need the extra help? Alternative schools, extra reading, extra math, tutoring, computers, textbooks, software, special teachers, guidance counselors, and even nurses I think should be encouraged to be funded under title I, because students who are not healthy have a hard time learning.

Students who have a learning disability are perhaps victims of child abuse at home. Perhaps they have been exposed to a tremendous amount of violence and they are just unable to learn. They are sad children. They are despondent. They don't see joy in their house. They see violence in their house. Guidance counselors cannot substitute for that, but they most certainly can help to get a child mentally to a place where they can learn. Yes, nurses and guidance counselors, there are successes. That is one of the reasons I believe so strongly in title I because we are not mandating to the local governments. We are giving them complete flexibility. They can use it to meet these new accountability standards. I most certainly know they would take full advantage of this in making improvements.

Let me end with the example of the research that has been done. There is a study which talks about funding for poor students.

When we have been able to fund and target our dollars, the scores of poor students in high concentrations of poverty increase. The research shows this. We don't have to be the least bit worried about this money being put to good use. As we march forward on our accountability standards and new tests—and there are real consequences for failure—the local governments now have a tremendous incentive. If they didn't have it before, they now have a tremendous incentive to put their money to good use and to get their test scores up and to create the kind of atmosphere in their schools of which we would all be proud.

The Prospects study was done on the performance of seventh graders in high and low poverty districts. This shows the discrepancy between the way stu-

dents perform in schools that have low-poverty rates and the way students can't perform in schools that have high-poverty rates.

Again, let me stress that children who are born into poverty have as much talent and as many God-given gifts as children who are not. God really is very fair in his allocation of gifts. He doesn't reserve them to one group. He generously bestows gifts on children from many different walks of life. It is not a talent deficit that exists here. It is not an ability deficit that exists here. It is a political will deficit that exists. We need to correct it with this and other similar amendments.

These are math grades for the seventh grade. You can see the low-poverty schools. These are more affluent schools and not very high-poverty rates. These are A students—who are getting A's in their tests. The pass rate for their math tests was 87 percent. A students, with the same ability—they are straight A students—but they are students in high-poverty schools, their average pass rate was 36 percent, a 50-percentage-point difference.

For B students, it is the same: 56 percent pass, but in the poverty schools only 34 percent pass. For C students, 41 percent pass but in the poverty schools only half of that—22 percent—pass.

Let's go to reading where it is even more dramatic. For A students in low-poverty schools, 81 percent of the students pass their reading proficiency test. But A students—bright students, good students—who are poor but are trying hard, they only pass at 36 percent based on this study.

As you can see from the chart, for the B students, the ratio of low-poverty students to high-poverty students who pass is 49 percent to 19 percent; for C students, it is 23 percent to 13 percent; and for D students, it is 23 percent to 14 percent of the students. The pattern is set and the pattern is troublesome.

The pattern shows that when students are in low-poverty schools, they tend to do better on their testing and excel at their studies. The studies show that even smart kids—good kids, kids who are trying hard, who are getting good grades—when they find themselves in high concentrations of poverty, which, unfortunately, exists in our country because of prejudice, because of unequal opportunity, because of past discriminations, even though they are trying, continue to fall short of the mark.

In closing, let me just say one thing about reading. If we in this country do not help every child read—I know we cannot do everything; I know money does not grow on trees; I know taxpayers work hard for it; I know people do not like to pay a lot of taxes to any government—local, State or Federal, but paying taxes is an important thing to do when it comes to education.

Supporting the education of our children is so crucial. It is important for every businessperson. It is important for everybody building a future in our Nation. It is important to our country. If we could just do one thing, it would be to get children reading well at that magic age of 8 or 9 because when a child masters that skill, a child begins to think positive about themselves. Even if their parents are not literate, even if their parents are having difficulty, that child can then take the role of educating the whole family. That child will think well of himself or herself and then can master math and science and social studies.

When we have large numbers of children concentrated in high-poverty schools, and when we have our money so dispersed throughout the country, we are missing the target. And that target is poor children who need to learn to read early so that they can succeed in their studies and be part of their community and part of our Nation.

Under this amendment, the funding would hold every school district harmless so no school district would lose money. But all the new money that was added, whether it was for Ohio or for Louisiana, would go to helping children who need the most help.

Let's hit the bull's-eye. Let's be that partner that these children so desperately need. And I can promise you, they will do more than their share. I know the children. I know their energy. We have all seen them: our own and our neighbors' and our friends'. If we just help them, they will meet us more than halfway and succeed, not fail. They will be proud; their parents will be proud of them; their communities will be proud of them, and the Nation will prosper from their education and their efforts.

I ask the Senator from Ohio, how many minutes would the Senator like?

Mr. DEWINE. I think my colleague from Tennessee will proceed for a couple minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield back the remainder of my time, but I think we have 2 hours reserved for this debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. I think we will be talking for another hour and 15 minutes. We can take the time for the Senator from Ohio off our time. We will be going back and forth.

Mr. President, I very briefly want to say that much of the debate over the last several weeks has been on how we can best improve the system, modernize the system, reform the system, and consolidate, streamline local control, and have more accountability. That is one element.

The other element that we keep referring to is the whole element of money, of how many Federal dollars should be injected.

This particular amendment really asks a much different question than those two. Basically it says, given the dollars that are out there—whatever they might be—how can we best invest those and reform the system to accomplish what we all want to do. And that is to leave no child behind.

I say that only because so many of the amendments have to do with new dollars or new programs. This really puts that aside and says, given whatever dollars we are going to allocate, how can we best invest those specifically as they apply to title I or low-income students?

I believe the principle in this amendment is that the money we, as a Congress, intend to invest in title I, or intend to invest in low-income students, needs to get there—or needs to get close—and that in spite of good intentions since the 1995 reform—and going back to 1965—the money has not arrived.

Again, it is not new money. It is not a new program. It is really dealing with a more prudent use of it to make sure that, once implementation takes place, those dollars go to the low-income students, which is where the money was intended by the will of Congress to go.

I congratulate my colleague from Louisiana, and also her cosponsor, the Senator from Ohio, in bringing forward the underlying principle in the amendment itself.

I yield time, as necessary, to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, first, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his very excellent comments. I also thank my colleague from Louisiana for her great leadership in this area. It has been a pleasure to work with her on this amendment, as it is a pleasure to work with her on so many other issues relating to our children. She is a real champion for our Nation's children. And I think this amendment is a good reflection of that compassion and how much she cares about our children.

This amendment is aimed specifically at helping children in those districts most in need of Federal assistance. Our amendment would simply ensure that any increases in title I funding above fiscal year 2001 levels would be directed to grants for school districts with the highest concentrations of poverty. In other words, our amendment directs the limited and finite Federal education resources to the schools where they can do the most good, to the schools that are in most need, the kids who are in most need.

A little history: Title I dates back to 1965 when the Congress and President Johnson created this act. The Federal Government, through title I, stepped in and created a program in an effort to help address the needs of children in

low-income areas, where the districts simply could not meet the basic needs of the children. That was the rationale for title I.

Understandably, over the course of the last 3½ decades, the Federal role in education has broadened. Often that broadening role of the Federal Government in those programs has been driven more by politics than by the needs of low-income students. So in an attempt to get back to the original intent of title I, the original Federal mission in education—to direct dollars to those districts and those kids most in need—the 1994 reauthorization legislation created a separate title I grant program. This new program that was created 7 years ago was supposed to address the unique needs and challenges of students in communities with extremely high concentrations of impoverished children. That is what we intended to do and said we were doing 7 years ago.

However, though authorized in 1994, to this day not a single Federal dollar has been appropriated to fund this grant program. This simply must change. As a result of this failure to appropriate any money, thousands of children in the very highest poverty communities are not getting the attention they deserve from this Government. The money that was supposed to reach the most impoverished districts is simply not getting there.

Actually funding these grants is a necessary part of any plan to help improve our Nation's neediest schools. While our amendment is very simple, I believe it will have a big impact. Quite frankly, it is an amendment whose time has come. Once and for all, it is time to get serious about the children in those districts most in need. It is time to stop paying lip service to these kids and to focus some money on them.

We have an obligation in this Congress and in this country to ensure that every single child in America receives a good, solid, quality education. Ultimately, a quality education for a child today is the key to that child's quality of life in the future; tragically, though, not all children are getting the quality education they deserve.

Our society today is divided, divided along economic and educational lines. This division is nothing new. Scholars and sociologists have been warning us for years that this was where our Nation was heading, particularly if we did not properly educate our children. Unfortunately, we did not heed the warnings. As a result, our Nation today is a Nation split into two Americas—one where children get educated and one where they do not. The gap in educational knowledge and economic standing is entrenching thousands upon thousands upon thousands of children into an underclass, a permanent underclass, and into futures filled with

poverty and little hope, little opportunity, and little room for advancement.

That is exactly what is happening in my home State of Ohio. Tragically, that is what is happening all across our great country. Ohio is generally a microcosm of the rest of our country. When we look at this growing gap, the development of the two Americas, what we see in Ohio is also what we see in our Nation. There now exist two Ohios; there now exist two Americas.

In Ohio, growing income and educational disparities are creating our very own permanent underclass. Most of Ohio is doing very well economically and doing well from an education point of view. The children in most of Ohio are doing very well and have a great future. However, when we look across our entire State, we see two areas where that is not the case, areas where our children are not being educated as well as we would like. One place is in rural Appalachia, the 20 to 25 counties that comprise our Appalachian counties. The other area is in our core cities, our inner cities. It is in these areas where we as a State—and also as a country—face our greatest challenges.

This is a problem that is not unique to Ohio. Rather, it is a huge societal problem which is pushing society further and further apart to create the two Americas of which I spoke.

Tragically, it is the children who are suffering the most. According to the National Center for Children in Poverty, between 1979 and 1998 the national child poverty rate increased by 15 percent, rising from 3 million children in poverty to over 13 million, or 19 percent. In Ohio, during that same period, the rate increased by over 50 percent. We in Ohio went from over 164,000 children in poverty to over a half a million today, or 18 percent.

These children are at risk, every single one of them. The structural conditions of poverty make it very difficult for these children to succeed in life and move up and out of their impoverished circumstances. The fact is that with poverty often come drugs, crime, broken homes, unemployment, violence, and lower educational levels. In fact, according to the National Center for Educational Statistics, in 1999 young adults living in families with incomes in the lowest 20 percent of all family incomes were five times as likely to drop out of high school as their peers from families in the top 20 percent of the income distribution—five times more likely to drop out.

Moreover, most of the research concerning high school dropouts generally concludes that socioeconomic status is the most important single factor in student dropout rates. Just look at the class of 2000 graduation rates for cities in Ohio, for those school districts.

In Akron, 72 percent of the city's high school students graduated that

year. That is actually a high rate for an urban area. In Toledo, only 67 percent graduated. In Columbus, it was only 62 percent. And in Youngstown, it was 59 percent. Dayton, OH, graduated that year 57 percent of its students; Canton, 53 percent; Cincinnati, only 51 percent. In Cleveland, OH, in the year 2000, only 34 percent of the students who started high school actually finished. That is right, 34 percent. Two-thirds of those kids did not graduate.

It is not surprising that 32 percent of Cleveland City schoolteachers have fewer than 5 years' experience, giving the district one of the largest percentages of inexperienced teachers in the State.

Those figures in Cleveland are not unusual. You will find such statistics in major cities across our country. The simple fact is that the more experienced teachers with better training, more practice, are being lured away from our city schools to the suburbs by more money and, many times, simply better working conditions.

Before anyone becomes too complacent or thinks maybe they don't have this problem in their State, let me remind my colleagues in the Senate that what is happening in Cleveland and other Ohio cities is not unusual, nor is it only happening in our State. What is happening in Ohio is typical of many urban areas.

My guess is that if we look at the other major cities in this country, we will find similar disturbing statistics, similar rates of poverty, and similar rates of high school dropout. I believe the best way we can get to these children before we lose them is through a quality education.

Horace Mann, former president of Antioch College in Yellow Springs, OH, the community where my wife Fran and I grew up, and who is known as the father of public education, once said the following:

Education, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer, the great equalizer of the conditions of man—the balance-wheel of the social machinery.

This is exactly what education can and should do. It should provide all children, regardless of their economic circumstances or family backgrounds, with the tools they need to make it as adults in our society, with the tools necessary to rise above individual situations of poverty and instability, individual situations of hopelessness and despair.

As my colleagues in the Senate know, today's educational system is not always meeting this goal. Don't get me wrong. I am not blaming the schools, and I am not blaming the teachers for all of society's and education's ills. Rather, I am suggesting that we, as a society, are failing to use the awesome power and potential of our schools to the maximum extent to help give these poor children the future they deserve and the future they need.

No matter where a child lives, whether in Portsmouth, OH, or New York City, every one of the 1.8 million children in the Ohio public school system and every one of nearly 47 million children in public schools nationwide deserve the opportunity to learn and to become educated.

Let's face it: Our schools have our children in their care 7, 8 hours a day, 5 days a week. That is not a lot of time, but it is time our schools and our country simply cannot afford to waste.

I am reminded of a line from a 1970s song that said: "Your dreams were your ticket out."

For all too many children—children living in poverty—dreams alone are not enough. For those children, a dream and a solid education is their ticket out.

This is not a new concept. Historically, our schools have been the best opportunity for children to move out, to move up, to advance, to change their lives. Education has built our Nation. We are truly a nation of immigrants who, because of public schools, because of education, escape ignorance, illiteracy, and lives of poverty. A strong education tradition in this country kept entire generations from being marginalized and left behind. For them, education was their ticket out of despair and toward opportunity.

For the children in this country today who are growing up under very difficult circumstances, education should be their ticket out as well. I believe that we in this body and in this Federal Government, in deciding how to spend the finite money we are going to put into education, have an obligation to target those children who are most in need, to target those children for whom an education will make the most difference. That is what the amendment that has been offered by my colleague, MARY LANDRIEU from Louisiana, Senator LIEBERMAN, myself, and others, will do.

When education is not working to give our kids the tools they need to move ahead in life, those children suffer. We can't always fix broken homes; we can't always fix every societal problem; but we can use the finite Federal dollars that we have and that we are going to spend on education to at least help close the education gap in America. That is exactly what this amendment will attempt to do. It targets money to those kids who are most in need.

Let me conclude my remarks by referencing an editorial that ran in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on February 28 of this year. The editorial talked about the importance of restoring the original mission of the title I program. The editorial said the following:

The most important and valuable suggestion [in education reform] regards the targeting of Federal dollars to poor students. Over the years, the program designed to



meet this need, title I, has become so diluted that more than 90 percent of all districts now receive support from it. It would be far more effective if Federal officials insisted that title I money go to students who truly need it.

That is exactly what this amendment does. It directs our limited Federal resources to the children most in need. It seeks to close the educational gap in our Nation and, in the process, help narrow the economic gap. This amendment will use education dollars and will use education to equalize the environment for our children. That is the right thing for us to do.

Ultimately, the Federal role in education accounts for only about 8 percent of the money that a typical school district gets. And even though the bill before us will significantly increase the Federal dollars that are going into education, we know it is still going to be a very small percentage of the money a typical school district gets. Knowing that, doesn't it make sense to prioritize some of this additional money—all the additional money, actually—that we are going to put into title I, to our children most at risk and most in need?

I believe we must be prudent and wise in allocating those limited Federal resources. That means we should direct those dollars, first and foremost, to America's neediest school districts, to its neediest children. It makes sense to do that. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, I see several colleagues on the floor. I want to, again, compliment my colleague from Louisiana for this very strong and powerful amendment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 15 minutes.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 15 minutes.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 469 AS MODIFIED, 519, 634 AS MODIFIED, 635 AS MODIFIED, AND 440 AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC, TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first of all, we are in a position to clear amendments by consent. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for these amendments to be considered en bloc, that any modifications, where applicable, be agreed to, the amendments be agreed to en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 469 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for local family information centers, and for other purposes)

On page 773, strike lines 20 through 24, and insert the following:

**"SEC. 6106A. LOCAL FAMILY INFORMATION CENTERS.**

"(a) CENTERS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall award grants to, and enter into con-

tracts and cooperative agreements with, local nonprofit parent organizations to enable the organizations to support local family information centers that help ensure that parents of students in schools assisted under this part have the training, information, and support the parents need to enable the parents to participate effectively in their children's early childhood education, in their children's elementary and secondary education and in helping their children to meet challenging State standards.

"(b) DEFINITION OF LOCAL NONPROFIT PARENT ORGANIZATION.—In this section, the term 'local nonprofit parent organization' means a private nonprofit organization (other than an institution of higher education) that—

"(1) has a demonstrated record of working with low-income individuals and parents;

"(2)(A) has a board of directors the majority of whom are parents of students in schools that are assisted under this part and located in the geographic area to be served by the center; or

"(B) has a special governing committee to direct and implement the center, a majority of the members of whom are parents of students in schools assisted under this part; and

"(3) is located in a community with schools that receive funds under this part, and is accessible to the families of students in those schools.

**"SEC. 6107. PARENTAL ASSISTANCE AND LOCAL FAMILY INFORMATION CENTERS.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) RESERVATION.—Of the amount appropriated under subsection (a) for a fiscal year—

"(1) the Secretary shall reserve \$50,000,000 to carry out this part, other than section 6106A; and

"(2) in the case of any amounts appropriated in excess of \$50,000,000 for such fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate an amount equal to—

"(A) 50 percent of such excess to carry out section 6106A; and

"(B) 50 percent of such excess to carry out Parent Information and Resource Centers under this part.

AMENDMENT NO. 519

(Purpose: To authorize the School Security Technology and Resource Center and to authorize grants for local school security programs, and for other purposes)

On page 577, line 2, strike the double quote and period.

On page 577, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

**"SEC. 4304. SCHOOL SECURITY TECHNOLOGY AND RESOURCE CENTER**

"(a) CENTER.—The Attorney General, the Secretary of Education, and the Secretary of Energy shall enter into an agreement for the establishment at the Sandia National Laboratories, in partnership with the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center—Southeast and the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement in Little Rock, Arkansas, of a center to be known as the 'School Security Technology and Resource Center'.

"(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The center established under subsection (a) shall be administered by the Attorney General.

"(c) FUNCTIONS.—The center established under subsection (a) shall be a resource to local educational agencies for school security assessments, security technology devel-

opment, evaluation and implementation, and technical assistance relating to improving school security. The center will also conduct and publish school violence research, coalesce data from victim communities, and monitor and report on schools that implement school security strategies.

"(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, \$2,750,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004, of which \$2,000,000 shall be for Sandia National Laboratories in each fiscal year, \$2,000,000 shall be for the National Center for Rural Law Enforcement in each fiscal year, and \$750,000 shall be for the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center Southeast in each fiscal year.

**"SEC. 4305. LOCAL SCHOOL SECURITY PROGRAMS.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—

"(1) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From amounts appropriated under subsection (c), the Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to local educational agencies to enable the agencies to acquire security technology for, or carry out activities related to improving security at, the middle and secondary schools served by the agencies, including obtaining school security assessments, and technical assistance, for the development of a comprehensive school security plan from the School Security Technology and Resource Center.

"(2) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a local educational agency shall submit to the Secretary an application in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including information relating to the security needs of the agency.

"(3) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to local educational agencies that demonstrate the highest security needs, as reported by the agency in the application submitted under paragraph (2).

"(b) APPLICABILITY.—the provisions of this part (other than this section) shall not apply to this section.

"(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004.

**"SEC. 4306. SAFE AND SECURE SCHOOL ADVISORY REPORT.**

"Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Energy, or their designees, shall—

"(1) develop a proposal to further improve school security; and

"(2) submit that proposal to Congress."

AMENDMENT NO. 634 AS MODIFIED

On p. 881, line 22, strike "and", and on page 881, insert the following new subsections after line 25:

"(J) remedial and enrichment programs to assist Alaska Native students in succeeding in standardized tests;

"(K) education and training of Alaska Native Students enrolled in a degree program that will lead to certification as teachers;

"(L) parenting education for parents and caregivers of Alaska Native children to improve parenting skills (including skills relating to discipline and cognitive development), including parenting education provided through in-home visitation of new mothers;

"(M) cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center and designed to share the Alaska Native culture with schoolchildren;



“(N) a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum and designed to share Alaska Native culture with urban students in a rural setting, which shall be known as the Rose Culture Exchange Program;

“(O) activities carried through Even Start programs carried out under part B of title I and Head Start programs carried out under the Head Start Act, including the training of teachers for programs described in this subparagraph;

“(P) other early learning and preschool programs;

“(Q) dropout prevention programs such as Partners for Success; and

“(R) Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement program.”

On page 882, strike lines 16 through 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section the same amount as the authorization provided for activities under the Native Hawaiian Education Act in section 7205 of this Act for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

“(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated and made available under this section for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available not less than \$1,000,000 to support activities described in subsection (a)(2)(L), not less than \$1,000,000 to support activities described in subsection (a)(2)(M), not less than \$1,000,000 to support activities described in subsection (a)(2)(N); not less than \$2,000,000 to support activities described in subsection (a)(2)(Q); and not less than \$2,000,000 to support activities described in subsection (a)(2)(R).”

On page 884, after line 7, insert the following new part:

**“PART D—Educational, Cultural, Apprenticeship and Exchange Programs for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and Their Historical Whaling and Trading Partners in Massachusetts.”**

**“SEC. 7401.—SHORT TITLE.**

“This part may be cited as the ‘Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Education Through Cultural and Historical Organizations Act’.

**“SEC. 7402.—FINDINGS.**

“Congress finds the following;

“(a) Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians have been linked for over 200 years to the coastal towns of Salem, MA and New Bedford, MA through the China Trade from Salem and whaling voyages from New Bedford;

“(b) Nineteenth century trading ships sailed from Salem around Cape Horn up the Northwest coast of the United States to Alaska, where they traded with Alaska Native people for furs, and then went on to Hawaii to trade for sandalwood with Native Hawaiians before going on to China;

“(c) During the nineteenth century, over two thousand whaling voyages sailed out of New Bedford to the Arctic region of Alaska, and joined Alaska natives from Barrow, Alaska and other areas in the Arctic region in subsistence whaling activities;

“(d) Many New Bedford whaling voyages continued on to Hawaii, where they joined Native Hawaiians from the Neighboring Islands;

“(e) From these commercial and whaling voyages, a rich cultural exchange and strong trading relationships developed among the three peoples;

“(f) In the past decades, awareness of these historical trading, cultural and whaling

links has faded among Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and the people of the continental United States;

“(g) In 2000, the Alaska Native Heritage Center in Alaska, the Bishop Museum in Hawaii, and the Peabody-Essex Museum in Massachusetts initiated the New Trade Winds project to use twenty-first century technology, including the Internet, to educate schoolchildren and their parents about historic and contemporary cultural and trading ties which continue to link these diverse cultures;

“(h) The New Bedford Whaling Museum, in partnership with the New Bedford National Historical Park, has developed a cultural exchange and educational program with the Inupiat Heritage Center in Barrow, Alaska to bring together the children, elders and parents from the Arctic region of Alaska with children and families of Massachusetts to learn about their historical ties and about each other's contemporary cultures;

“(i) Meaningful educational and career opportunities based on traditional relationships exist for Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and for low income youth in Massachusetts, within the fast-growing cultural sector;

“(j) Cultural institutions can provide practical, culturally relevant, education-related intern and apprentice programs, such as the Museum Action Corps at the Peabody-Essex Museum and similar programs at other institutions, to prepare youths and their families for careers in the cultural sector; and

“(k) The resources of these five institutions provide unique opportunities for illustrating and interpreting the contributions of Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, the whaling industry and the China Trade to the economic, social, and environmental history of the United States, for educating schoolchildren and their parents, and for providing opportunities for internships leading to careers in cultural institutions.

**“SEC. 7403.—PURPOSE.**

“The purposes of this part are to—

“(1) authorize and develop innovative culturally-based educational programs and cultural exchanges to assist Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and children and families of Massachusetts linked by history and tradition to Alaska and Hawaii to learn about shared culture and traditions;

“(2) authorize and develop internship and apprentice programs to assist Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and children and families of Massachusetts linked by history and tradition with Alaska and Hawaii, prepare for careers in cultural institutions; and

“(3) supplement programs and authorities in the area of education to further the objectives of this part.

**“SEC. 7404.—PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

“(1) GRANTS AND CONTRACTS.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, or enter into contracts with, the Alaska Native Heritage Center in Anchorage, AK, the Inupiat Heritage Center in Barrow, AK, the Bishop Museum in Hawaii, the Peabody-Essex Museum in Salem, MA, the New Bedford Whaling Museum and the New Bedford Historical Site in New Bedford, MA, other Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian cultural and educational organizations, cultural and educational organizations with experience in developing or operating programs which illustrate and interpret the contributions of Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, the whaling industry and the China Trade to the economic, social, and environmental history of the United States, and consortia of such or-

ganizations and entities to carry out programs that meet the purposes of this part.

“(2) PERMISSIBLE ACTIVITIES.—Activities provided through programs carried out under this part may include—

“(A) the development and implementation of educational programs to increase understanding of cultural diversity and multicultural communication among Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and the people of the continental United States, based on historic patterns of trading and commerce;

“(B) the development and implementation of programs using modern technology, including the internet, to educate schoolchildren, their parents, and teachers about historic and contemporary cultural and trading ties which continue to link the diverse cultures of Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and the people of Massachusetts;

“(C) cultural exchanges of elders, students, parents and teachers among Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and the people of Massachusetts to increase awareness of diverse cultures among each group;

“(D) the sharing of collections among cultural institutions designed to increase awareness of diverse cultures and links among them;

“(E) the development and implementation of internship and apprentice programs in cultural institutions to train Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and low income youth in Massachusetts for careers in cultural institutions;

“(F) other activities, consistent with the purposes of this part, to meet the educational needs of Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and children and their parents in Massachusetts.

**“(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—**

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2002 there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 6 succeeding fiscal years.

“(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated and made available under this section for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall make available—

“(A) not less than \$2,000,000 each to the New Bedford Whaling Museum in partnership with the New Bedford National Historical Park in Massachusetts, and the Inupiat Heritage Center in Alaska to support activities as described in subsection (a)(2).

“(B) not less than \$1,000,000 each to the Alaska Native Heritage Center in Alaska, the Bishop Museum in Hawaii, and the Peabody-Essex Museum in Massachusetts for the New Trade Winds project to support activities as described in subsection (a)(2); and

“(C) not less than \$1,000,000 each to the Alaska Native Heritage Center in Alaska, the Bishop Museum in Hawaii, and the Peabody-Essex Museum in Massachusetts for internship and apprenticeship programs, including the Museum Action Corps of the Peabody-Essex Museum, to support activities as described in subsection (a)(2).

**“SEC. 7405.—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**

“(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—No grant may be made under this part, and no contract may be entered into under this part, unless the entity seeking the grant or contract submits an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

“(b) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY COORDINATION.—Each applicant for a grant or contract under this part shall inform each local educational agency serving students who will participate in the program to be carried

out under the grant or contract about the application.”

AMENDMENT NO. 635 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To Establish the Close-Up Fellowship Program)

On page 383, after line 21, add the following:

**SEC. 203. CLOSE UP FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.**

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.), as amended by section 202, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

**“PART E—CLOSE UP FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM**

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . FINDINGS.**

“Congress makes the following findings:

“(1) The strength of our democracy rests with the willingness of our citizens to be active participants in their governance. For young people to be such active participants, it is essential that they develop a strong sense of responsibility toward ensuring the common good and general welfare of their local communities, States and the Nation.

“(2) For the young people of our country to develop a sense of responsibility for their fellow citizens, communities and country, our educational system must assist them in the development of strong moral character and values.

“(3) Civic education about our Federal Government is an integral component in the process of educating young people to be active and productive citizens who contribute to strengthening and promoting our democratic form of government.

“(4) There are enormous pressures on teachers to develop creative ways to stimulate the development of strong moral character and appropriate value systems among young people, and to educate young people about their responsibilities and rights as citizens.

“(5) Young people who have economically disadvantaged backgrounds, or who are from other under-served constituencies, have a special need for educational programs that develop a strong sense of community and educate them about their rights and responsibilities as citizens of the United States. Under-served constituencies include those such as economically disadvantaged young people in large metropolitan areas, ethnic minorities, who are members of recently immigrated or migrant families, Native Americans or the physically disabled.

“(6) The Close Up Foundation has thirty years of experience in providing economically disadvantaged young people and teachers with a unique and highly educational experience with how our federal system of government functions through its programs that bring young people and teachers to Washington, D.C. for a first-hand view of our government in action.

“(7) It is a worthwhile goal to ensure that economically disadvantaged young people and teachers have the opportunity to participate in Close Up’s highly effective civic education program. Therefore, it is fitting and appropriate to provide fellowships to students of limited economic means and the teachers who work with such students so that the students and teachers may participate in the programs supported by the Close Up Foundation. It is equally fitting and appropriate to support the Close Up Foundation’s ‘Great American Cities’ program that focuses on character and leadership development among economically disadvantaged young people who reside in our Nation’s large metropolitan areas.

**“Subpart 1—Program for Middle and Secondary School Students**

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ESTABLISHMENT.**

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants in accordance with provisions of this subpart to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, District of Columbia, a nonpartisan, nonprofit foundation, for the purpose of assisting the Close Up Foundation in carrying out its programs of increasing understanding of the Federal Government among economically disadvantaged middle and secondary school students.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants under this subpart shall be used only to provide financial assistance to economically disadvantaged students who participate in the program described in subsection (a). Financial assistance received pursuant to this subpart by such students shall be known as the Close Up Fellowships.

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . APPLICATIONS.**

“(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—No grant under this subpart may be made except upon an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(b) CONTENT OF APPLICATION.—Each such application shall contain provisions to assure—

“(1) that fellowship grants are made to economically disadvantaged middle and secondary school students;

“(2) that every effort shall be made to ensure the participation of students from rural and small town areas, as well as from urban areas, and that in awarding fellowships to economically disadvantaged students, special consideration will be given to the participation of students with special educational needs, including students with disabilities, students with migrant parents and ethnic minority students; and

“(3) the proper disbursement of the funds received under this subpart.

**“Subpart 2—Program for Middle and Secondary School Teachers**

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ESTABLISHMENT.**

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants in accordance with provisions of this subpart to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, District of Columbia, a nonpartisan, nonprofit foundation, for the purpose of assisting the Close Up Foundation in carrying out its programs of teaching skills enhancement for middle and secondary school teachers.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants under this subpart shall be used only to provide financial assistance to teachers who participate in the program described in subsection (a). Financial assistance received pursuant to this subpart by such students shall be known as the Close Up Teacher Fellowships.

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . APPLICATIONS.**

“(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—No grant under this subpart may be made except upon an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(b) CONTENT OF APPLICATION.—Each such application shall contain provisions to assure—

“(1) that fellowship grants are made only to teachers who have worked with at least one student from such teacher’s school who participates in the program described in section \_\_\_\_ (a);

“(2) that no teacher in each school participating in the programs provided for in section (a) may receive more than one fellowship in any fiscal year; and

“(3) the proper disbursement of the funds received under this subpart.

**“Subpart 3—Program for New Americans**

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ESTABLISHMENT.**

“(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants in accordance with provisions of this subpart to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, District of Columbia, a nonpartisan, nonprofit foundation, for the purpose of assisting the Close Up Foundation in carrying out its programs of increasing understanding of the Federal Government among economically disadvantaged secondary school students who are recent immigrants.

“(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subpart, the term ‘recent immigrant student’ means a student of a family that immigrated to the United States within five years of the students participation in the program.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants under this subpart shall be used only to provide financial assistance to economically disadvantaged recent immigrant students who participate in the program described in subsection (a). Financial assistance received pursuant to this subpart by such students shall be known as the Close Up Fellowships for New Americans.

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . APPLICATIONS.**

“(a) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—No grant under this subpart may be made except upon an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

“(b) CONTENT OF APPLICATION.—Each such application shall contain provisions to assure—

“(1) that fellowship grants are made to economically disadvantaged secondary school students;

“(2) that every effort shall be made to ensure the participation of recent immigrant students from rural and small town areas, as well as from urban areas, and that in awarding fellowships to economically disadvantaged recent immigrant students, special consideration will be given to the participation of those students with special educational needs, including students with disabilities, students with migrant parents and ethnic minority students;

“(3) that activities permitted by subsection (a) are fully described; and

“(4) the proper disbursement of the funds received under this subpart.

**“Subpart 5—General Provisions**

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**

“(a) ACCOUNTABILITY.—In consultation with the Secretary, the Close Up Foundation will devise and implement procedures to measure the efficacy of the programs authorized in subparts 1, 2, 3 and 4 in attaining objectives that include: providing young people with an increased understanding of the Federal Government; heightening a sense of civic responsibility among young people; and enhancing the skills of educators in teaching young people about civic virtue, citizenship competencies and the Federal Government.

“(b) GENERAL RULE.—Payments under this part may be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of underpayments or overpayments.

“(c) AUDIT RULE.—The Comptroller General of the United States or any of the Comptroller General’s duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to any grant under this part.

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions

of subparts 1, 2, 3 and 4 of this part \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

“(b) SPECIAL RULE.—Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), not more than 30 percent may be used for teachers associated with students participating in the programs described in sections \_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_.”.

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . NATIONAL STUDENT/PARENT MOCK ELECTION.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants to the National Student/Parent Mock Election, a national non-profit, nonpartisan organization that works to promote voter participation in American elections to enable it to carry out voter education activities for students and their parents. Such activities may:

“(1) include simulated national elections at least five days before the actual election that permit participation by students and parents from all 50 States in the United States and its territories, Washington, DC and American schools overseas and

“(2) consist of—  
“(A) school forums and local cable call-in shows on the national issues to be voted upon in an ‘issues forum’;

“(B) speeches and debates before students and parents by local candidates or stand-ins for such candidates;

“(C) quiz team competitions, mock press conferences and speech writing competitions;

“(D) weekly meetings to follow the course of the campaign; or

“(E) school and neighborhood campaigns to increase voter turnout, including newsletters, posters, telephone chains, and transportation.

“(b) REQUIREMENT.—The National Student/Parent Mock Elections shall present awards to outstanding student and parent mock election projects.

**“SEC. \_\_\_\_ . AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this part \$650,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the six succeeding fiscal years.”

**AMENDMENT NO. 440 AS MODIFIED**

(Purpose: To ensure that seniors are given an opportunity to serve as mentors, tutors, and volunteers for certain programs)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENIOR OPPORTUNITIES.**

(a) TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS.—Section 1609(a)(2) (as amended in section 151) is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(I) if the organization plans to use seniors as volunteers in activities carried out through the center, a description of how the organization will encourage and use appropriately qualified seniors to serve as the volunteers.”.

(b) SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES; GOVERNOR’S PROGRAMS.—Section 4114(d) (as amended in section 401) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (14), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (15), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(16) drug and violence prevention activities that use the services of appropriately qualified seniors.”.

(c) SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES; LOCAL DRUG AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMS.—Section 4116(b) (as amended in section 401) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “(including mentoring by appropriately qualified seniors)” after “mentoring”; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(ii) in clause (ii), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) drug and violence prevention activities that use the services of appropriately qualified seniors;”.

(2) in paragraph (4)(C), by inserting “(including mentoring by appropriately qualified seniors)” after “mentoring programs”; and

(3) in paragraph (8), by inserting “, which may involve appropriately qualified seniors working with students” after “settings”.

(d) SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES; FEDERAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 4121(a) (as amended in section 401) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by inserting “, including projects and activities that promote the interaction of youth and appropriately qualified seniors” after “responsibility”; and

(2) in paragraph (13), by inserting “, including activities that integrate appropriately qualified seniors in activities” after “title”.

(e) INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION; FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 7115(b) (as amended in section 701) is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (10), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(12) activities that recognize and support the unique cultural and educational needs of Indian children, and incorporate appropriately qualified tribal elders and seniors.”.

(f) INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION; SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS.—Section 7121(c)(1) (as amended in section 701) is further amended—

(1) in subparagraph (K), by striking “or” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (L), by striking “(L)” and inserting “(M)”;

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (K) the following:

“(L) activities that recognize and support the unique cultural and educational needs of Indian children, and incorporate appropriately qualified tribal elders and seniors; or”.

(g) INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION; PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.—The second sentence of section 7122(d)(1) (as amended in section 701) is further amended by striking the period and inserting “, and may include programs designed to train tribal elders and seniors.”.

(h) INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION; NATIVE HAWAIIAN PROGRAMS.—Section 7205(a)(3)(H) (as amended in section 701) is further amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in clause (iii), by inserting “and” at the end; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) programs that recognize and support the unique cultural and educational needs of

Native Hawaiian children, and incorporate appropriately qualified Native Hawaiian elders and seniors;”.

(i) INDIAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND ALASKA NATIVE EDUCATION; ALASKA NATIVE PROGRAMS.—Section 7304(a)(2)(F) (as amended in section 701) is further amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in clause (ii), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) may include activities that recognize and support the unique cultural and educational needs of Alaskan Native children, and incorporate appropriately qualified Alaskan Native elders and seniors;”.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment which is based on my bill S. 231, the Seniors as Volunteers in Our Schools which I introduced on January 31, 2001. I am pleased that Senators GRASSLEY, AKAKA, INOUE, CRAIG, BAUCUS and INHOFE are cosponsors of that bill.

Under this amendment, school administrators and teachers are encouraged to use qualified seniors as volunteers in federally funded programs and activities authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA.

Studies show that guidance by a caring adult can help reduce substance abuse and youth violence. Because every child deserves a safe learning environment, this amendment is an important step in ensuring that our schools provide a safe and caring place for our children to learn and grow. It will help build lasting partnerships between our local school systems, our children and our senior citizens.

Seniors have practical knowledge and wisdom gained from experience. They are as important a part of our national future as are our young ones in school. Improving the opportunities for learning for all Americans has been the focus of recent debate. We have faced weighty and costly decisions about education and the role the federal government ought to play in the education of our children.

But, there are also many practical opportunities we can offer in this endeavor that don't come at a high cost. My amendment offers such an opportunity. By making better use of all the gifts senior Americans have to offer, we can provide a framework to connect schools with appropriate seniors. My amendment does just that.

I urge my colleagues to support prompt passage of this amendment.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak for just a few minutes about my safe schools amendment to S. 1, the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act of 2001. My amendment, the Safe School Security Act of 2001, addresses an element that has not been given enough attention in the debate over ESEA, school security.

In recent years, we have witnessed too many tragic shootings that have

resulted in the deaths of students and teachers. While these school shootings are shocking and disturbing, and have received much attention, it is the everyday school violence and crime that plagues most students and teachers and interferes with their ability to learn and teach.

Today I offer an amendment that is designed to assist schools in reducing school violence and campus crimes. This legislation would establish the School Security Technology and Resource Center, SSTAR, in New Mexico to work in partnership with the Rural Law Enforcement Center in Arkansas and the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center in South Carolina.

In the 106th Congress, I introduced similar legislation to establish the School Security Technology and Resource Center, SSTAR, at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque, NM. While the bill was accepted by the Senate, and became part of the Juvenile Crime Bill in May 1999, the conference committee failed to produce a conference report and the bill never came before the full Congress for a vote.

Nonetheless, over the past 3 years, SSTAR has pursued its mission and has provided assistance to hundreds of schools across the country. In 1999, Sandia worked with the National Institute of Justice to publish what became the most widely requested document from NIJ last year: *The Appropriate and Effective Use of Security Technologies in U.S. Schools*. Last year, SSTAR put on a National School Safety Conference in Dallas, TX, for hundreds of school administrators and safety personnel from across the country. In the last 2 years, with limited resources, SSTAR provided tailored school security assessments for schools in Texas, Massachusetts, and the Navajo Nation.

The Texas project came about when SSTAR was contacted by the administration at Permian High School in Odessa, TX. Although Permian had not experienced any major acts of violence, the Columbine shootings made the administrators rethink the risks facing their large population of 2,200 students. Like most schools, Permian was also interested in reducing the everyday problems such as fights, theft, vandalism, graffiti and intruders on campus. In the end, the security upgrades and policy changes were well received by the school administration, parents and students.

The idea for SSTAR started in 1997 with a local initiative in New Mexico involving Sandia National Laboratories and a local high school that was experiencing a high number of student car break-ins, vandalism and theft of school property. Sandia Labs partnered with the community and local businesses to implement a wide variety of

security upgrades at Belen High School, just south of Albuquerque. In the year after they implemented the Sandia-designed plan, Belen experienced a 75 percent reduction in school violence, a 30 percent reduction in truancy, an 80 percent reduction in theft from vehicles, and a 75 percent reduction in vandalism. Interestingly, the drop in automobile break-ins seemed to reduce the level of conflict among students and provided many students with ease of mind. The drop in truancy, vandalism and violent crime convinced me that this was a program that should be available to all schools.

Because of Sandia's expertise in evaluating and designing security for our Nation's nuclear sites, Sandia is well suited to evaluate the security of our Nation's schools and advise school administrators on how to create safer learning facilities. This transfer of experience to a school setting has proved beneficial in many pilot projects around the country. SSTAR, when fully operational, intends to offer workshops to train school personnel in school security, provide security assessments for public schools, and test existing security technologies so schools do not spend precious resources on equipment that doesn't work or doesn't suit their needs.

The amendment I am introducing today also establishes a \$10 million grant program under the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program to assist schools in implementing security strategies. These grants will enable school to purchase high tech security equipment or implement low tech security upgrades. While our children's safety is of paramount concern, we should also aim to protect the significant investment by America's taxpayers in expensive computer equipment and other high-tech teaching tools prevalent in many schools today.

If students do not feel safe in their own schools, they cannot focus and perform to the best of their ability. If teachers do not feel safe in their classrooms, they cannot fully concentrate on teaching. I believe we have a responsibility to do what is in our power to make our children and teachers safe at school so they can focus on learning and educating. While we have invested in our national laboratories so they can protect our nuclear arsenal, and we have invested in our Federal buildings to protect our Federal employees and the general public, we have failed to adequately invest in our Nation's schools so they can protect our Nation's most valuable assets—our youth. SSTAR can fulfill this responsibility if given the proper resources.

Therefore, I urge my Senate colleagues to support this legislation. I thank Senator HUTCHINSON of Arkansas for partnering with me on this bill two years ago and for sticking by this worthwhile legislation. I also want to

thank Senators HOLLINGS and CORZINE for their willingness to cosponsor this bill. The services provided by SSTAR and the Rural Law Enforcement Center have benefitted many students, teachers, parents and law enforcement and I believe these services should now be shared with the entire country.

AMENDMENT NO. 519

Mr. KENNEDY. Those amendments are: Senator WELLSTONE's on family information centers, Senators BINGAMAN and HUTCHISON's on school security, Senator STEVENS' on cultural exchange, Senator LANDRIEU's on Close-up, Senator CAMPBELL's on senior opportunities.

Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the amendment of Senator LANDRIEU, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator DEWINE. We have title I grant discrepancies for two reasons. The first is legitimate. The second is a reflection of insufficient funds. Each State receives a different title I grant because it has different numbers of poor children and different per pupil expenditures. Since 1965, we have keyed the title I formula to the number of poor children in a State multiplied by State per pupil expenditure. The use of the per pupil expenditure is intended to reflect the different costs of education in different States and is intended to encourage States to increase their own education spending.

Those are worthy policies that we have had for many years. The reason we see discrepancies within the States is that districts have a great deal of flexibility in determining per child grants. Districts have to serve schools in rank order of poverty. So it goes through the States and then to the districts, and then they have to distribute funds on the rank order of poverty. But they can limit the size of the grants to serve many schools that are eligible.

Low poverty districts often have only one or two eligible schools. Those schools see all of a district's title I money, and have large per child grants accordingly. High-poverty large districts often have many schools eligible for title I funds, and these high-poverty districts often spread out their title I money among many eligible schools. Those schools, accordingly, see small per child grants.

I support the pending amendment to target limited funds. But the best thing we can do is to grow the total title I pot of funding so that districts do not have to spread limited funding among many poor schools. That is the bottom line.

There are four different formulas for title I. There are the basic grants, concentration grants, targeted grants, and education finance grants. They all have different bases for support—they benefit different numbers of poor children in different States and in different communities. There is great flexibility within the local school districts and

the amounts they are going to give per school. Therefore, you have the kinds of disparities we have heard talked about this afternoon.

The way to address that is to do what the Senate has done, and that is to support full funding for the title I program. When you have full funding of the title I program, these kinds of aberrations, as the two Senators pointed out, don't exist.

That is the best way to do it; otherwise, poor children will be fighting over scraps. We have the resources to address this issue. The Senate is on record supporting full funding of title I. I am strongly in support of that program.

As I have pointed out, we have a good bill. It is not the bill I would have written. It is not the bill I am sure my colleagues, Senator FRIST, Senator GREGG, and others would have written, or the President would have written, but it is a good bill. It can make an important difference for the children who are going to benefit from it. The fact is though that only a third of the children are going to benefit from this legislation because of the current level of insufficient funding.

I have behind me a chart which indicates increases in the ESEA budget since 1994. The ESEA is inclusive of the title I program. This chart reflects from 1994 to the year 2001. During the previous administration, we had a 8.6-percent increase in the ESEA budget, but under President Bush it is 3.6 percent.

If we look at it more closely, under the Administration's budget, in the outyears—2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010—there is virtually no increase. It is flat funded. There will not be an increase of funding for these needs. We are still going to have these extraordinary disparities. We can remedy that with the funding which this Senate has gone on record in a bipartisan way to support.

The next chart shows under the title I program, which is part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, there are 3.7 million children who are going to be reached, out of 10.3 million eligible poor children.

In fiscal year 2008, under the President's budget, it is 3.7 million. I do not know what happened to the pledge of leaving no child behind.

The Senator from Louisiana, in her excellent presentation, pointed out the number of children who are being left behind in those schools, as did the Senator from Ohio as well.

Under the bipartisan amendment offered by Senator DODD and Senator COLLINS, which was accepted in fiscal year 2002, we move up the number of children served to 5.7 million. We have important reforms, and we have important accountability—accountability for the schools, teachers, students, parents, accountability within the com-

munity, and we provide that for 5.7 million children.

We do state that at the time of the expiration of this legislation in the fiscal year 2008, no child will be left behind. Every one of those children who are missing out will be covered under the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Ohio. They will be able to get supplementary services and inclusion in summer school programs. They will have the opportunity of attending perhaps another public school if that is necessary. They will be able to go to afterschool programs and get supplementary services. That is under the proposal we have.

This is a question of resources. I believe we have a strong bill that can benefit the children for the reasons I have tried to outline. For many schools across this country that need it, there will be assistance with improvements. We are going to have reconstitution of schools where necessary. We have had a good debate and have taken strong action to make sure the evaluations of our children are going to be effective.

I have one more chart, and this illustrates what is happening in title I schools. The best estimate from the Education Commission of the States is that 10,000 schools at the present time are failing schools. Under the Bush budget, 2,440 of those schools will have some relief.

The average cost of turning schools around has been estimated at about \$180,000. Some do it for less. I have some examples. I will come back to those later in the debate. Some have required more. This is the best judgment about what will be necessary.

We are saying we ought to use \$1.8 billion of the \$6.4 billion increase for which this Senate has voted and turn the 10,000 schools around. We can do it. We know how to do it. The difference today is we know what works. We know how to educate children. We know what to do, and we know how to give them the support they need.

This legislation is crafted to create a sense of expectation for those children, to give them the support so they can reach that expectation, to give them the best trained teachers and modern curriculum, support for supplementary services, afterschool programs, new technology—all of those together is what we are committing.

We have a good bill which also includes funding for meeting our responsibilities for special needs children under IDEA.

We have an opportunity to address the very tragic circumstances the Senator from Louisiana has outlined in her excellent presentation, and the unfair circumstances and the disparities about which the Senator from Ohio talked. We have a way of doing it with the targeted resources for the new money. We can do it in that way, and

I certainly support using additional resources and targeting the way her amendment has been devised. But still even with that, we ought to be prepared to make the commitment to the children of this country that no child is going to be left behind.

That is what I thought the President wanted in his statement on education and what we can do.

With the passage of this legislation fully funded, we address the challenge the Senators from Louisiana and Ohio have put before us. We include funding for IDEA which will make the difference in local communities that are hard pressed to provide for the special needs children.

Over the next 5 to 7 years, the progress we have seen in local communities that utilize what we have included in this legislation will result in an important upgrading of the educational capabilities for the neediest children in this country.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for bringing this to our attention. No one can look at the illustrations the Senator presented and not believe this is grossly unfair. Also, no one can listen to the Senator from Louisiana talk about the progress that is being made in these classrooms when children are given the support they need, which they ought to receive, which we can do, but which they are being denied because we are not giving the funding.

We will miss an extraordinary opportunity if we fail to respond in a positive way to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana and to the broader issue raised by her amendment, and that is the funding for title I and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I inquire as to how much time is remaining under the unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor has 22 minutes 23 seconds. The opposition has 25 minutes 32 seconds.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield myself 10 of those minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I see some of my colleagues coming to the Chamber to speak on this amendment. Let me follow up, if I can, some of the points Senator KENNEDY made. He is absolutely right.

We have made in the last several weeks in this debate a tremendous amount of progress, taking some of the best ideas offered by our colleagues on the Republican side, some of the best ideas offered on the Democratic side. The President himself has come forward with a number of good ideas that have now been weaved into this underlying bill. We are in the process of perfecting it. Some amendments offered

on this floor have strengthened the underlying bill, including accountability, moving our money in a more targeted fashion.

Hopefully, with this amendment, we will take a giant step toward that particular goal, encouraging our system to start rewarding success, to stop funding failure, expecting good things from our teachers and our schools, then providing resources. All of these elements are important to the underlying bill.

Let me stress one thing I have said on the floor on many occasions: Investment without accountability is a waste of resources. Accountability without resources is a waste of time. We don't have a lot of time to waste. A childhood goes by so quickly. Those critical early years move quickly. These children cannot wait 3, 4, or 5 years to receive the training in reading and basic skills allowing for the foundation for an education that brings prosperity to themselves, wealth to their families, and hope to their children and to their grandchildren. We don't have a lot of time to waste.

Adopting this amendment is one step. Whatever money is allocated can be targeted better, and these presentations have shown where the gaps are. Senator KENNEDY is absolutely correct when he says this is just one step; without the funding to back up this targeting amendment, without the funding necessary so the Federal Government can live up to the responsibilities of funding special education, we will literally be passing a bill that might have a lot of fancy words, might even have a few wonderful quotes and thrilling lines; however, it will not have the power attached to change the lives of children if we do not match the resource to the rhetoric.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. This will be a lost opportunity for millions of children if we fail to provide the investments in the future of our country. Isn't that what this is about, trying to make sure children will have the ability to read, to do basic math?

Does the Senator agree, we have a good blueprint, but we are reaching only so many children, and without further investment, we are failing to meet the opportunity out there; if we fund those programs and invest, it is a landmark achievement?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Absolutely. To further illustrate this point, the critics of Federal aid to education say money doesn't matter; the children can't learn, or it will not help.

Studies have proven them wrong. I have tried to show in my presentation when investments are made, coupled with accountability, fantastic results are achieved.

Another argument is we have spent so much money in 30 years and nothing

is improving. Let me give the real facts for the record: Title I has barely kept pace with inflation. When it was created, 26 percent of our children were in poverty. Senator JOHNSON said: This is a shame. The Federal Government has a special role to play. These children don't live in communities with Fortune 500 companies. They don't live in wonderful homes with paved streets and running water and parks in which to play. There are districts, schools, places in America, rural and urban, where schools are having a hard time fixing the roof and turning the water on, let alone getting computers and learning. President Johnson said: let's step up to the plate. We put up some money. It was not enough then, and it is not enough now.

To fault the children for not learning or the teachers—because they cannot teach 35 children in their class, or they cannot teach if there is a rainstorm because they have to move to another class, and we wonder why they lose a few hours of instruction—is beyond comprehension. It has barely kept pace with inflation. It has been a 2.9-percent increase.

When I care about something in my house in my budget, I spend more than 2 percent on it. I might invest 10 percent, 20 percent, or make investments. Barely 2 percent a year overall was spent on education. Some of the money we have added has been for education generally in many new programs but not targeted to those students in rural and urban areas who needed the most help.

Let me close with one or two points. First, I commend President Bush for stating now on many occasions, in private meetings as well as publicly, that he supports targeting. He knows that in order to make his pledge real to not leave any child behind, the Federal Government must be a partner to those schools and to those children who desperately need someone to believe in them, to invest in them, and give hope.

The second point: Not only does the President support targeting, and he should be commended for his leadership, but 5 years ago our own congressional commission said there was overwhelming evidence that while title I had proven to be effective, the title I resources were not being targeted to the children who needed it the most. There were too many gaps to be filled. The Federal Government was not filling those gaps because the original formula was not correct. So we crafted a new formula, but we never funded it.

This amendment will, for the first time, help fund the formula we crafted, fund a formula the President supports. The only issue remaining, which I hope Senator LIEBERMAN will address in his remarks, is the fact that the best formulas in the world, the best ideas in the world, aren't worth a hoot if you can't fund them and don't fund them to

reach these children who want to learn, who can learn, and to help their parents and teachers help them meet their dreams.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, who is controlling the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is controlling the time.

Ms. LANDRIEU. How many minutes remain?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirteen minutes, and the opposition has 25 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield 5 minutes to Senator LIEBERMAN.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield additional time from the opposition, although I know the Senator is in favor of the proposal. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. LIEBERMAN. If the Senator has up to 10 minutes, I will be grateful for that.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 10 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. And 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware following that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I am pleased to rise today to support the amendment offered by Senators LANDRIEU and DEWINE, a bipartisan amendment. I particularly express my appreciation to the junior Senator from Louisiana for her persistent and principled pursuit of this ideal, which we believe is essential to the success of the sweeping reforms we have included in this measure and to our paramount goal of helping all of America's children, regardless of income, learn at the highest possible level.

We have said this bill could be described in a phrase that might go like this: "Invest in reform and insist on results." I think we have the insistence on results in the bill now. The question is whether we are going to invest in reform. And the question is whether we are going to not just put more money into the bill, but as Senator LANDRIEU has said, make sure it gets to the kids in America who need it most. That is what this amendment aims to do.

The underlying bill has the potential to be truly transformational, to change not just the way we administer Federal programs but, more importantly, the way we educate our children to help close the persistent and pernicious achievement gap separating the haves and have-nots in our country and thereby help better realize the promise of equal opportunity, which is the ideal, the driving ideal of American life.

All that potential in this bill will be squandered if we do not also change the way we distribute Federal education



funding, to target our resources on the schools and particularly on the students with the greatest needs.

As my colleagues know and Senator LANDRIEU just indicated, that was the original intent of the ESEA at its programmatic heart, to compensate for local funding inequities within States and help level the educational playing field for disadvantaged children. But the reality is that after all these years, 36 years since title I was adopted, it is not working in practice as it was designed in principle.

The reality is that title I is not nearly as focused on serving high-poverty communities and children as it is supposed to be and that many poor children, therefore, are not getting the aid and attention they deserve and need.

Our amendment aims to fix that imbalance, to renew the true mission of title I, and do so in a way that will enable the bill before us to make good on its promise. Across party lines, as we have worked on this bill, we fought for the tough new accountability system included in the proposal to hold our educators responsible for meeting high standards and to impose real consequences for chronic failure—in fact, not to accept failure in the education of our children. But this engine of reform—accountability—could turn into a form of punishment for our children if we do not back up these demands with new dollars and channel those dollars to the most disadvantaged cities and towns, to the places that have the most ground to make up. That is exactly what this amendment would do.

I suspect many people are under the impression this is already the case and wonder why this amendment is necessary. The fact is, we continue to spread title I dollars too thin and too wide. According to a report by the CRS, 58 percent of all schools in our country receive at least some title I funding, including many suburban schools with predominantly well-off students. Of the schools that receive no title I support at all, on the other hand, a disturbing number have a high concentration of poor students. In fact, one out of every five schools with poverty rates between 50 percent and 75 percent do not get a dime of title I funding—not any title I funding at all. That happens, of course, because of the formulas. We do not provide enough funding to serve every eligible student creating a zero-sum game played through formulas, and the formulas we use are poorly targeted to need.

Most title I funds are distributed through the basic grants formula. In the current year, 85 percent of the \$8.6 billion appropriated went through that channel. But under that channel, any district with at least 2 percent of its students living below the poverty level qualifies for funding. That threshold is so low that more than 9 out of every 10 school districts in America receive

some title I dollars. As a result, not nearly enough funding is left over to meet the burdens of the highest poverty districts.

Congress recognized the problem and sought to begin to fix it in the reauthorization of this legislation in 1994 with broad bipartisan support. We adopted a new formula, the targeted grants formula, which is the only one of the four title I funding formulas that is specifically designed to address the unique needs of school districts with high concentrations of poverty. As an indication of the high priority we have placed on that formula, the 1994 reauthorization directed that all new funding above the fiscal year 1994 level be allocated under that formula. Unfortunately, we have not abided by that requirement and not one dime of funding has yet to pass through that targeted formula.

In the first instance, the appropriators made that choice, but I would say to my colleagues, we are all complicit in it. We have all voted to approve those bills. We have all overlooked the inequities in the system. We are all responsible for the consequences of a funding system that promises one thing and delivers quite another.

There is more than a matter of basic equity here because studies show us that poor children, living in areas with high concentrations of poverty, are at far more risk of educational failure than poor children living in more affluent areas. Therefore, those areas of concentration need more help.

Thanks to my friend and colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, I think we have met half the challenge facing us. This bill, through the Dodd amendment, calls for funding of title I, full funding of title I. That is a very significant statement, which I hope the President will embrace as we continue to negotiate on appropriations levels. This amendment would meet the second half of the challenge and make the first half work as the bill originally was intended to do. It would put the Senate on record again in support of funding the targeted formula, but would do so with some teeth by saying that no new title I dollars could be allocated under this bill until we sufficiently fund the targeted formula.

This is a matter not of parochial interest but of national interest because of the critical national interest we have in developing all of America's human capital to realize the promise of opportunity but also to benefit our society and our economy. That is why several prominent and diverse groups are joining in backing this amendment that we are offering, including: the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Education Trust, the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the National

League of Cities, the National Urban League, and the National Alliance of Black School Educators. They have said publicly that they believe better targeting is critical to closing the achievement gap.

We know some of our colleagues who may agree with us in principle may be reluctant to support this amendment, perhaps because they do not want to get the bill caught up in a formula fight. But without the formula debate, without guaranteeing that the funds flow to the most needy children, this bill will ultimately not mean very much.

I would also say the fight occurred 7 years ago and Congress stated unequivocally that all new title I funding should be channeled through the title I formula. All we are doing with this amendment is trying to get us to abide by the agreement that was made and adopted 7 years ago.

There is an important principle at issue here that I hope we do not forget. This bill is ultimately not about number runs or aggregate State dollars received. It is not about who wins or who loses in States and districts. This is about the lives of children across America who depend on us to do what is best for them. Ultimately, we do not fund States or districts, or even schools. We fund children and their education.

At the Federal level it has been our special mission to help the Nation's poorest children, to see that they get a fair shot at the American dream.

I appeal to my colleagues in this Chamber and in the other body not to judge this bill by how much it does for our particular States or how much it does for a particular House district but by how much it does for our neediest children. This amendment will take us a long way in that principal direction.

I thank my fellow cosponsors. I thank President Bush who on numerous occasions—most recently in a bipartisan meeting at the White House last week on this underlying bill before us—said he understands that to realize the goal he has set, which is to leave no child behind in our education system, we can't just put the money out there, we have to target the money to the kids who need it most.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am happy to support Senator LIEBERMAN, BAYH, DEWINE, and LANDRIEU's targeting amendment today. This initiative symbolizes what the New Democrats stand for.

Targeting ESEA money to the children most in need has long been one of our top priorities. It is commonly assumed that title I is already targeted to poor children.

In reality, 85 percent of all title I funds are allocated according to the basic grant formula that does not take concentration of poverty into account.



The remaining 15 percent, which last year was \$1.2 billion, was distributed amongst two-thirds of our Nation's schoolchildren.

Under this plan, districts with 15 percent poverty received the same proportional benefit as districts with 90 percent poverty. That's why, the last time we reauthorized ESEA, we created the targeted grants formula. It was an effort to direct the scarce resources to the areas of highest poverty. We had good intentions, but bad follow-through. The targeted grants formula has never been funded.

I know that changing a funding formula is a detailed and complicated endeavor—whether it is transportation dollars, the Older Americans Act, or title I. But we must make the difficult decisions—and in essence, get more for our dollars. The more we are able to concentrate our resources in areas most in need, the more we can close the achievement gap in our Nation.

This amendment should be even less complicated than I have described above, because we do not seek to change the formula, we only ask that we follow the formula that we established in law.

Some of the debate during this reauthorization has been about the role of the Federal Government in K-12 education.

What should the Federal Government be doing in this area that is so predominantly in the jurisdiction of State and local governments. My view is that the federal role is to level the playing field in our nation of such diversity.

Every child should have an equal chance to have a solid public school foundation on which to build their life. The Federal Government—although only supplying about 7 percent of the funding for K-12 education, should direct that money to those students most in need. Title I was created for the purpose of doing just that.

This amendment, and the leadership of Senators LANDRIEU and LIEBERMAN, get us closer to that level playing field. I am proud to join Senator DEWINE and others, in supporting one of the Senate New Democrats' top priorities.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senators LANDRIEU and DEWINE in offering an amendment that we believe is essential to the success of the sweeping reforms included in this reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA and to our paramount goal of helping all children learn at a high level.

This bill has the potential to be truly transformational, to change not only the way we administer Federal programs but the way we educate our children across this country, to help close the persistent and pernicious achievement gap separating the haves from the have nots in this country, and in time to help realize the promise of

equal opportunity for every American child. But we are afraid that potential could be squandered if we do not also change the way we distribute Federal education funding to target our attention and resources on the schools and students with the greatest needs.

As my colleagues know, that was the original intent of ESEA and its programmatic heart, Title I—to compensate for local funding inequities within states and help level the educational playing field for disadvantaged children. But the reality is, as we intend to show today, Title I is not working in practice as it was designed in principle. The reality is that Title I is not nearly as focused on serving high-poverty communities as it is perceived to be, and that many poor children are not getting the aid and attention they deserve and need as a result.

Our amendment aims to fix that imbalance, to renew the true mission of Title I, and to do so in a way that will make the bill before us make good on its promise. We as New Democrats fought for the tough new accountability system included in this proposal. We fought to hold our educators responsible for meeting high standards, and to impose real consequences for chronic failure. But this engine of reform for schools could turn into a form of punishment for children if we do not back up these demands with new dollars, and channel those funds to the most disadvantaged cities and towns, to the places that have the most ground to make up. And that is exactly what our amendment would do—target most of the new Title I dollars to the districts with the highest concentration of poor children.

I suspect that many of our colleagues are under the impression that this is already the case and that our amendment is therefore unnecessary. But the fact of the matter is that we have and continue to spread Title I dollars thin and wide. According to a CRS report, 58 percent of all schools receive at least some Title I funding, including many suburban schools with predominantly well-off students, from Beverly Hills in California to Greenwich in my home State of Connecticut. Of the schools that receive no Title I support at all, on the other hand, a disturbing number have high concentrations of poor students. In fact, one out every five schools with poverty rates between 50 percent and 75 percent do not receive any Title I funding at all.

How does this happen? The answer lies in the fact that we do not provide enough funding to serve every eligible student, creating a zero-sum game played through formulas, and that the formulas we use are poorly targeted to need. Most Title I funds are distributed through the Basic Grants formula—in the current fiscal year, 85 percent of the \$8.6 billion appropriated went through this channel. Under this for-

mula, any district in which at least 2 percent of its students live below the poverty level qualifies for funding. This threshold is so low that more than 9 out of every 10 districts in America receive some Title I dollars. And, as a result, not nearly enough funding is leftover to meet the burdens of the highest-poverty districts.

To dramatize the inequities of this distribution system, the Progressive Policy Institute prepared what it calls a tale of two cities, a comparison of the Title I profiles of Beverly Hills and Compton in South Central Los Angeles. On the one hand, Compton has 97 percent of its children eligible for free and reduced lunch, compared to 8 percent in Beverly Hills; and Compton has 43 percent of its students from families on welfare, compared to 4 percent in Beverly Hills. On the other hand, Beverly Hills has a tax revenue base that is 400 percent higher than Compton; Beverly Hills has 90 percent of its teaching force certified, while Compton has 37 percent; Beverly Hills students rank consistently in the 80th percentile on national math and reading tests in 4th and 8th grade, while Compton students hover around the 25th percentile. Yet when it comes to Title I funding, Beverly Hills receives \$597 per eligible student, while Compton receives \$720. Those figures just don't add up, logically or morally. How can we expect Compton to compensate for all its disadvantages with just \$123 more per student?

Congress recognized this problem and sought to begin fixing it in the reauthorization of the ESEA in 1994. With broad bipartisan support, we adopted a new formula, the Targeted Grants formula, which is the only one of four Title I funding formulas that is specifically designed to address the unique needs and challenges of school districts with high concentrations of poverty. And as an indication of the high priority we placed on this new formula, the 1994 reauthorization further directed that all new funding above the FY 1994 level be allocated under this formula.

Unfortunately, Congress has yet to abide by this requirement, and not one dime of funding has yet to pass through the Targeted formula. This is a choice that the appropriators have consistently made, but I would say to my colleagues that we are all complicit in it. We have all voted to approve these appropriations bills for the past seven years. We have all overlooked the inequities of this system. And we are all responsible for the consequences of this funding system that promises one thing and delivers another.

We are speaking out today because those consequences are too serious and the stakes for this bill too high to tolerate the status quo any longer. We must realize that by spreading Title I

funds so thin and wide, we are seriously diluting their impact, undermining the effectiveness of this critical program, and undercutting the promise of equal opportunity for all children. This dilution is evident in my own State, where in the 1999-2000 school year, 74 percent of Connecticut's school districts had student poverty percentages of less than 15 percent, and received a combined total of about \$8 million in Title I funds. In addition, 30 percent of the school districts had student poverty percentages of less than 5 percent and received a combined total of about \$2.5 million in Title I funds.

Our point is not that poor children living in those more middle class and affluent areas do not need help. They certainly do. We are simply saying that given our limited Federal resources, we have an obligation to focus first on those communities that have the greatest needs and the least capability to meet them on their own. The fact of the matter is that 40 percent of all students eligible for Title I live in the Nation's 200 poorest communities. It is those communities where the achievement gap is most pronounced. And it is those communities that must be our priority if we are going to ensure that no child is left behind.

This is more than a matter of basic equity. Studies show us that poor children living in areas with high concentrations of poverty are at far more risk of educational failure than poor children living in more affluent areas. A comparison of Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, TAAS, results, for example, found that after controlling for income, low-income students in Alamo Heights Schools District, with only 17 percent poverty, had much higher rates of passage than those in San Antonio, with 88 percent poverty. Sixty-one percent of Alamo Heights' low-income students passed the TAAS, versus only 39 percent in San Antonio. And looking more broadly, a study from the U.S. Department of Education concluded that "the relationship between family poverty status and student achievement is not as strong as the relationship between school poverty concentrations and school achievement averages."

It is particularly in places like San Antonio and Compton that we are hoping to drive real change with the reform plan before us. Many of these disadvantaged districts are already making significant progress in turning around underperforming schools and turning up their academic achievement. I am particularly proud of what Hartford has accomplished since the State declared it an educational disaster area and took over the school system. We want to encourage other districts to pursue the same kind of bold reforms. We want to provide them with the resources and the freedom to make those reforms work. And at the

end of the day, we are for the first time going to hold them accountable for producing results.

But we have good reason to be skeptical about this bill's effectiveness if we do not target funding to those communities that need it most. Indeed, we may be setting up many poor students and disadvantaged schools to fail. This is basic math. We cannot realistically expect high-poverty schools, who have the farthest to climb, to fill acute shortages of qualified math and science teachers, to invest in innovative curricula and teaching methods, and to do whatever else it takes to meet the ambitious goals set out in this new system without substantial additional support. That means not only more Title I funding, but far better targeting.

Thanks to my friend and colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, we have met half the challenge. This bill, through the Dodd amendment, calls for full funding of Title I, and that is a significant statement, which I hope the President will heed as we continue to negotiate on appropriation levels. Our amendment would meet the second half of the challenge. It would put the Senate on record again in support of funding the Targeted formula, by saying that no new Title I dollars can be allocated until we sufficiently fund the Targeted formula. We know this formula, like any formula, is far from perfect, and it is going to have its own quirks in equity. But it's the best we have got, and until we find a better way, which I hope we will, we need to fund it.

Several prominent groups and advocates for disadvantaged children are joining us in this effort—Congressional Black Caucus, Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the American Federation of Teachers, Education Trust, National League of Cities, National Urban League, National Alliance of Black School Educators, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. They have said publicly that they believe better targeting is critical to closing the achievement gap.

We know some of our colleagues who may agree with our principle will be reluctant to support this amendment because they do not want to get caught up in a formula fight. To them I would simply say we already had this fight. It was settled seven years ago when Congress stated unequivocally that all new Title I funding should be channeled through the Targeted formula. All we are doing with this amendment is trying to get us to abide by that peace treaty. This is just restating what is already the law.

But there is an important principle at issue here that we cannot forget. This is not about number runs or State aggregates, or who wins or who loses. This is about the lives of children who depend on us to do what is best for

them, not our political fortunes. Ultimately, we do not fund States or districts or even schools. We fund children. And at the Federal level, it has been our special mission to help the nation's poorest children to see that they get a fair shot at the American dream.

As of today that's not happening. Not when 63 percent of African-American and 58 percent of Latino fourth-graders are reading below basic levels, according to the most recent NAEP results, compared to 27 percent of whites. Not when 60 percent of disadvantaged fourth-graders are reading below basic, compared to 26 percent of advantaged. And not when African-American and Hispanic 12th-graders on average read and do math at the same level as 8th-grade white students.

What we do today is not going to singlehandedly erase this achievement gap, which is a national disgrace. That is going to take a lot of hard work by dedicated educators, most of which will occur school by school, classroom by classroom. But it will make a real difference, and for that reason I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the larger cause of targeting.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been informed by Senator KENNEDY that we have two final speakers before the vote. Senator CARPER is going to speak for 10 minutes, and the Senator from Wyoming is going to speak for 15 minutes on an unrelated subject. I alert everyone that we will probably vote at about 5:20. I don't know who is first with these two Senators. After that, I believe that basically all time will be used. The opposition has been kind enough to yield time. But the time for Senator CARPER is still controlled by the Senator from Louisiana. She has already yielded to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank both Senator LANDRIEU and Senator LIEBERMAN for the leadership they have shown in getting us on the right track—I think the track we intended to be on.

A friend of mine who used to be my education adviser when I was Governor of Delaware for a number of years used to say that all of us can learn but some of us learn differently. Some of us learn faster than others, but all of us can learn.

We are talking about title I, which is a program the Federal Government introduced some 35 years ago to really make sure that young people in our schools—very young people and not so young people—who need extra help in learning to read are going to get it. If they need extra help in math, they are going to get it. Our job is to make sure they get that extra help which they need to enable them to be successful.

We are seeking through the debate in the last couple of weeks, and certainly

the debate through this week, to redefine the Federal role in education. Nobody here believes the role of the Federal Government in education is to run our schools in Delaware, Nebraska, or in any other State. The role of the Federal Government, as Senator LIEBERMAN said, is to try to help level that playing field so that all kids have a real shot at meeting the academic standards that have been established in their States.

In the course of the debate on this bill, we are agreeing on a number of important principles. One is that we ought to be investing more money and to transition Federal resources to raise student achievement. We ought to give that money to schools so that school districts have more flexibly with fewer strings, that we can provide more money and fewer strings, that we ought to require results and demand results. That means accountability and consequences for schools and students who do well, as well as for those who do not do well.

Another thing on which we agree is the need for parents to have greater choices in where they send their kids to school—to have a public school choice and charter schools as well.

During the course of this debate, one of the things I have learned—and Senator LIEBERMAN just said it again—is that for a lot of our schools around the country that have a fair amount of poverty, we don't fund title I. It is a strange thing. In a school where the level of poverty is over 50 percent, over half the kids are getting free or reduced-price lunches. That is a school where we can provide title I money and extra learning time for kids who need it. But in about 20 percent of our schools, we don't do that at all.

Nobody here is interested in throwing money at the problem. We are interested in investing money in programs that work, especially where the need is the greatest.

I have stood here on the floor in the last couple of weeks and talked about three programs that we know work where we don't invest the money we ought to be investing. The first is Head Start. We provide Head Start funding for fewer than half of the eligible 3- and 4-year-olds in this country. States such as Delaware and Ohio have provided extra money on their own to help make it possible for all 4-year-olds in Delaware, for example, to be in the Head Start Program. But nationally, the Federal Government provides Head Start money for fewer than half of the eligible 3- and 4-year-olds. We know it works. We just do not provide the money.

Another program is the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act and Federal money for special education programs. We are supposed to, by agreement, provide up to 40 percent of the funds in States across America for

students in special education programs. Do we do that? No. We don't provide 40 percent, or 30 percent, or 20, or even 10 percent of the funding. We know it works. But we don't invest the money.

The third program we are talking about today with title I is the Extra Learning Time Program, which the Federal Government funds. We don't fund money for every child who is eligible for the program. We don't provide extra money and time for even half of the kids who are eligible. It is one out of three; that is all.

In a situation where we know the program works and we know that if we invest the money we will raise student achievement, in the situation where we have a little more money in terms of our budget surplus than we have had in recent years, having taken some of that money off the table through a tax cut—we don't have unlimited money—I think it is incumbent on us, as we increase the spending, to spend a little extra money in this title I for Extra Learning Time. Let's spend it where the kids are most needy. Let's target that money where it will make the most difference. It is really common sense.

Let me close by saying this. I talk a lot about Delaware. That is the State I know most about, just as other Members know about Louisiana, Nebraska, or their respective States. I visited a little school in southwestern Delaware a week or so ago, West Seaford Elementary. I met with the principal, a number of the teachers, and an administrator or two. We talked about a variety of ways in which we are trying to raise student achievement. I will mention a couple of them.

There is a State program in the department that provides services for children. Their emphasis is to put in that school a social worker—a family crisis therapist who is a go-between for that school and the families who are in a crisis to work; a go-between to help make sure whatever is going wrong at home gets fixed—the child has a better learning environment at home, and the parents will be able to work with the kids at school.

I met with a woman who coordinates the mentoring program. She comes in every week and works with kids to help them in this school. There was also a teacher in the room funded by smaller classroom size appropriations. In other words, we provide money for smaller classrooms. They use that money to hire extra teachers. There was a lady there who was funded out of that. Finally, there was a title I teacher there who worked with kids, especially with their reading.

These were part of the team that works very successfully at West Seaford to make it possible for just about every kid to reach the standards we set in our State in reading and writing and math.

One of the best things we have done in this legislation is provide some extra money and provide more flexibly so that schools such as West Seaford can use those disparate sources of State and Federal and local moneys in ways that they know will work to help their kids do better.

While I applaud the fact that we are providing extra money through this authorization bill—and we are going to provide that money with more flexibility—we demand accountability.

Hopefully, tomorrow with the Carper-Gregg amendment, we will work a little more on poverty parents through public schools and charter schools. I think it is important, as we spend those extra dollars, to make sure they go to the schools where the need is the greatest.

In this day and age where one out of every five schools and where well over half of the kids living in poverty don't have access to the help they get in title I, that is wrong. We can fix it here. My hope is that by agreeing to this amendment, we will do just that.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we are debating education, and we are debating a new direction in education. That is what the overall difference is that I address in the amendment. The new direction we are talking about is increased flexibility so that the schools can use the money to the best advantage possible.

I am really pleased to see a lot of funds come to Wyoming. But there was a small amount that we could not use. By the time we wanted to hire the required administrator, there was no money left in the program. Now we will be able to combine those programs and have fewer administrators and, hopefully, less paperwork.

To listen to the debate, it grows more and more to sound as if the Federal Government should fund all of education. The States fund 93 to 94 percent of education. What we are trying to do is to allow them to use the money—that little bit of money they get from the Federal Government—as effectively as possible.

I had an intern who worked for me. He had been a principal at a school and he got a leave of absence. He came to Washington and did a little checking to see what happened to the paperwork he had to fill out for years and years. He was delighted to find that every piece of paper he sent back to Washington was well read. It was examined to make sure every t was crossed and every i was dotted. It was examined to make sure every blank was filled in, and that it was filled in properly.

What he was disappointed to find out was that that was the end of the road for that piece of paper. We provide 6 to 7 percent of the money, depending on

whose figures you use, and we force over 50 percent of the paperwork. How do we do that? We build a huge bureaucracy in Washington. Every time we do a new program or add more funding to a program, we hire more bureaucrats in Washington; the money does not get to the classroom.

Throughout the debate, you will hear that we do not provide the money for—fill in the blank—or we do not provide enough money for—fill in the blank. Remember, what the Federal Government is doing is providing about 6 to 7 percent of the local funds. It is a State responsibility to provide education. They have been doing it. They have had the main role in doing it.

In Wyoming, we have a provision in our State constitution that says all children will have an equal opportunity for education. We have had court cases over the years that have determined the money has to go to the State and the State has to distribute it on an equal basis, so that all kids get an equal education.

That is a difficult thing to do. We have a lot of rural communities. When you have rural communities, they have different needs and different capabilities than a city. A big high school in a city might be able to provide a wide range of courses. A small rural area might only be able to offer the basic courses. Is that an equal education? It is very difficult to determine.

But it sounds to me, from a lot of the discussion, that it is time we press the States to make sure they are providing an equal education. It has not been our fault that some schools get a lot more funding and some schools get a lot less funding. There are some exceptions, and we try to take care of those exceptions. But I do not think we are placing nearly enough pressure on the States to do the job of having equality that would solve a lot of the problems we are talking about in this Chamber.

But today I mainly want to talk about the issue of technology. Senator DORGAN brought that up early this morning. He and I have an amendment on which we have been working. Senator CANTWELL and I have been working on another amendment.

Mr. President, as a former computer programmer and someone who is very interested in technology and all its applications, I am glad to know that increasing access to technology has been receiving national attention. While technology can never replace a caring, qualified teacher or involved parents, it can open a child's eyes to worlds they might otherwise never have a chance to experience. I firmly believe that the educational opportunities afforded by technology can and should be harnessed in a child's pursuit of academic success. There is also evidence that the need for skilled workers is rising and technology is becoming an increasingly valuable asset as students

move from the classroom into the job market. I have been disappointed to see that over the past few years the Federal Government has tried to support educational technology through a fragmented set of programs with money flowing through multiple bureaucratic agencies. This kind of disorganized Federal funding has generated tremendous amount of bureaucratic redtape that has not helped States and local school districts ensure that all children have access to technology.

The legislation that we are debating today, the overall bill, S. 1, the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act, changes all this. It consolidates current technology programs authorized through the Elementary and secondary Education Act to create a targeted State formula program geared towards improving the use of technology in the classroom. This change in the structure of Federal technology programs is a great thing for small or predominantly rural States such as Wyoming, which may not receive enough money from a particular categorical program, as I mentioned earlier, to effectively achieve the goal of increasing technology. When this legislation passes, Wyoming will have the ability to use Federal funds to implement the technology programs they believe will be most useful to students. This legislation also makes it easier for States that may not have the resources to hire a professional grant writer and are therefore at a disadvantage when it comes to applying for the competitive grants that have traditionally been used to allocate technology funding.

Under this new formula, States will have the flexibility to implement technology to support and expand school reform efforts with a focus on improving student achievement and academic performance, provide ongoing professional development to help integrate technology into school curriculum, acquire hardware and software, and repair and maintain school technology equipment.

The Better Education for Students and Teachers Act supports a comprehensive system to effectively use technology in elementary and secondary schools to improve academic achievement and student performance. Specifically, the goal of title II, part C of this legislation is to assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every child is technologically literate by the time they finish the eighth grade.

I am pleased to report that Senator DORGAN and I have completed work on an amendment that will help to give rural schools comprehensive assistance to make sure that our children have the technological background they will need to be successful in the 21st century. Senator CANTWELL and I have also drafted an amendment that will

help ensure that the findings of the Web-based Education Commission, of which I was a member, are used to allow States and local school districts to effectively implement technology in a variety of areas.

With the increasing national focus on technology, I am pleased to report the State of Wyoming has determined that technology is so critical to their educational success that they have put considerable time and effort into the development, ongoing implementation, and revision of a comprehensive education technology plan. This plan does a great job of identifying Wyoming's needs, defining our infrastructure requirements, articulating goals for educational technology, and proposing strategies for achieving these goals. It was compiled by teachers, school boards, communities, libraries, State agencies, businesses, and other interested citizens from around the State.

Wyoming outlined some ambitious objectives in their technology plan, such as establishing educational partnerships among public and private entities, implementing improved professional development geared towards technology, integrating technology into instructional delivery systems, providing equal access to interactive information resources for all students, and creating an evaluation process to determine if their plan is working. As Federal legislators we must clear away any obstacles and unnecessary redtape that would slow or stop the implementation of the goals that so many people in Wyoming have worked so hard to develop.

I would also like to stress that the appropriate use of technology in education can and should go beyond the classroom. For example, Wyoming has also done a great job of utilizing Federal technology funds in an innovative way by establishing a website—that is, [www.wyoming.edgate.org](http://www.wyoming.edgate.org)—that provides services for students, teachers and parents. If you want to know how your child's school is doing, you can go to the web site and find out. This website also allows teachers to access innovative curriculum ideas, gain information about professional development options, or access the latest information on teaching techniques. Students can get help on their homework. They can view notes from their teachers, or even research a science project. Parents have the ability to check on their child's homework assignments, gain information on options for paying for college, get ideas about how to talk to their kids about drugs, or even check their school's test scores to ensure instant accountability. While Wyoming was able to use Federal funds for this program, current law required the State to expend valuable time and resources to get a waiver from the Federal Government.

I am also very pleased with Wyoming's efforts to develop a distance

education system that will allow kids in any high school across the State to participate in courses such as advanced placement English and calculus, Japanese, Russian, art history, sociology, anthropology, and on and on. It has made selection of classes in the very rural schools much greater than it was before.

Considering the rural and sometimes geographically isolated nature of some of Wyoming's communities, it is a tremendous asset. This type of distance learning will allow an unprecedented level of educational equity in my State, where students in small schools that serve 20 students or less will be able to receive the same diversity in course offerings as students in the much larger schools. It will also allow areas that have difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers to share in the teaching expertise of other areas of the State without traveling the miles and miles and miles.

The same distance learning system also provides Wyoming with great opportunities for providing continuity in our professional development programs. Teachers from around the State will now have the chance to participate in proven and effective professional development that will improve the educational opportunities for all of our students.

Speaking of professional development efforts that incorporate technology, I have been very impressed by the work of project WYO.BEST. This pilot program in Platte County School District No. 1 in Wheatland, WY, has been working to help teachers improve their ability to teach in a standards-based, technology-enriched environment geared towards improving student learning and achievement, and they have been doing this since 1997. Over 100 teachers in southeast Wyoming have received sustained training and mentoring in student-centered instructional approaches, in standards-based instruction, and in technology integration. All of this has been done under the guidance of their director of instruction, Roger Clark. I take this opportunity to commend him for his efforts.

The progress that has been made by the State of Wyoming is impressive, but we are certainly not alone. States across the country have been making tremendous progress not only in incorporating effective uses of technology in the classroom but in preparing students to pursue technical careers after graduation.

A good example of this is the PPEP TECH High School in Tucson, AZ, which I recently had a chance to visit. This school is part of a publicly financed statewide system that provides an alternative educational program for students age 15 through 21 in grades 9–12. The school's primary focus is on providing high academic standards and

technological training for the children of migrant and seasonal farm workers in rural Arizona and for at-risk students, high school dropouts, or students who work. Each student is actively engaged in an individualized educational program that helps them obtain a high school diploma, improve their job skills, and continue on the postsecondary education.

Laptop computers and 1-800 numbers allow the children of migrant workers to move frequently and still work with the same teachers. They submit their homework; they get their grades by using the Internet. Here is an effort to make sure that no child is left behind.

I have also been very impressed with the efforts of an organization called the JASON Project. This organization offers students and teachers in grades 4–9 a comprehensive multimedia approach to enhanced teaching and learning in science, technology, math, geography, and associated disciplines. Included in the project's components are State-aligned curricula, video programming, satellite transmissions, online activities, and professional development training. Hands-on learning is provided for the visual learners, while sounds help oral learners to achieve. I am pleased to report that 35 teachers in Freemont County, WY, are currently preparing to receive training that will enable them to participate in this program.

The JASON Project provides a new program topic each year. For example, the 2001–2002 school topic of "Frozen Worlds" will take students and teachers on a virtual adventure of some of the colder regions of our planet and solar system, such as Alaska and the polar regions. Students will then examine research questions such as what are the dynamic systems of earth and space; how do these systems affect life on earth; what technologies do we use to study these systems; and why.

As you can see, there are many options that allow teachers and students to integrate technology into the classroom. Our first responsibility as Federal legislators is making sure States and local school districts have the ability to implement the programs they feel are most effective.

Once again, I commend my colleagues on the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee on their hard work on this legislation. I intend to support S. 1 and any other legislation that helps States such as Wyoming by giving them the flexibility they need to determine the best way they can help their own students gain access to technology.

I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask for 3 additional minutes: 1 minute for

the Senator from Louisiana, I would like 1 minute, and 1 minute for the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator from Massachusetts will yield, would the Senator also ask en bloc for the yeas and nays on both amendments?

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask for the yeas and nays on both amendments, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to ordering the yeas and nays with a show of hands? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to say that I am looking forward to supporting the Landrieu amendment. It is an excellent amendment. It will, as she pointed out, give greater targeting of resources to the children who most need it.

I am strongly in support of the Bond amendment.

We are asking all of those colleagues who have amendments to bring these amendments up. We have been on this bill one way or the other for 7 weeks. Now the leader has indicated to me that we are going to stay until we finish this bill this week. Members must bring up their amendments. Otherwise, we will establish a time for the completion of the bill, and Members will have to come over and object and we will consider their amendments then. The leader has said we will stay this week until we finish.

It is Monday now. I hope we can. It is a good bill. We want to consider other amendments that are necessary, but we insist now that Members come over and offer their amendments so we can complete consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I want to reiterate the importance of having the amendments before us. We have been able to go through a large number of amendments. We agreed upon several about an hour and a half ago. It is very important that people understand that in order to fulfill the will of the American people to really make sure we leave no child behind, we have to finish consideration of the bill. We would like to finish as soon as we can.

I, too, support the Bond amendment and the Landrieu amendment, both of which involve no new programs, no new money, both of which I believe improve the underlying bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, in closing, I again thank Senators KENNEDY, FRIST, DEWINE, LIEBERMAN, CARPER, and others, for the bipartisan support of this important amendment to a very important bill.

We have spent 2 hours speaking about the history of title I, the good

intentions in the way it was originally crafted, but how over time, for understandable reasons, it has been diluted and is no longer effective, particularly to try to meet the challenges this new piece of legislation, this reform piece of legislation, will present.

We have talked about the success stories of title I—that when it is properly directed, it can work because it can reduce class size, extend school time, support students in their learning, providing the help in the classroom where these children need it the most.

Let me use 30 seconds in my closing to dispel something that some Members have a question about. The question is, Will my State lose money?

The answer is no. In this amendment, there is a hold harmless provision. No State will lose money. For the record, let me say, Iowa moves from \$53 million to \$69 million, based on a \$3.7 billion investment; Connecticut will move from \$82 million to \$108 million; Delaware will go from \$22 million to \$31 million; Massachusetts will go from \$177 million to \$215 million; Ohio goes from \$298 million to \$412 million; Louisiana, my home State, goes from \$187 million to \$279 million. But no State loses money.

Let me say that title I should be about funding children. It should be about giving children a chance, being a partner with children. Whether they live in rural or urban areas, they are poor; they don't live in districts with large companies and a big tax base. If we don't help, no one will. This amendment is the right thing to do. I ask for a good vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the Landrieu vote, the second in order, there be 1 minute on each side before the vote occurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the vote will now occur in relation to amendment No. 476 offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent delivering a commencement address.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) would each vote "aye."

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Leg.]

#### YEAS—93

Akaka	Dorgan	McCain
Allard	Edwards	McConnell
Allen	Ensign	Mikulski
Bayh	Enzi	Miller
Bennett	Feingold	Murkowski
Bingaman	Feinstein	Murray
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Graham	Nickles
Brownback	Gramm	Reed
Bunning	Grassley	Reid
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Byrd	Harkin	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hatch	Santorum
Cantwell	Helms	Sarbanes
Carnahan	Hollings	Schumer
Carper	Hutchinson	Sessions
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Cleland	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Clinton	Jeffords	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kohl	Stevens
Corzine	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Landrieu	Thompson
Crapo	Leahy	Thurmond
Daschle	Levin	Torricelli
Dayton	Lieberman	Voinovich
DeWine	Lincoln	Warner
Dodd	Lott	Wellstone
Domenici	Lugar	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—7

Baucus	Gregg	Smith (OR)
Biden	Inouye	
Durbin	Kerry	

The amendment (No. 476), as modified, was agreed to.

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I regret that I was delayed in reaching the Senate floor and missed the vote on Senator BOND's amendment to the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act that would serve to strengthen parental involvement in the education of their child.

I feel very strongly that parents should play an active and informed role in the education of their child, and I am pleased that my colleague, Senator BOND, offered an amendment to further encourage active and informed parental involvement.

Recent studies have helped us better understand the role that our biological development plays in our ability to learn and understand. These studies reinforce the need for early and consistent parental involvement in their child's social and cognitive development.

While I regret being absent during this vote, I am pleased that the Senate overwhelmingly agreed to this amendment. Helping parents better understand their child's developmental stages, and offering more ways for them to be involved in their child's education, will certainly lead to better education programs and more opportunities for our children.●

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 475

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I speak in the absence of the Senator from Louisiana who is privileged to be off the floor with her mother and father. On behalf of this amendment, which Senator LANDRIEU, Senator DEWINE, and I have cosponsored, we have come together on a bipartisan basis on the policy in this bill to demand educational results for the children of our country.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. I hope the Chair will use that gavel vigorously. It will not crack. It only cracked once in the history of the Senate.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. In an effort to maintain order, we now have the sponsor, and I yield to Senator LANDRIEU.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask for a vote on our amendment. We had a good 2-hour discussion about targeting the funds. As I said in my presentation, no State will lose money. There is a hold harmless provision in this amendment. Every State will gain money. Most importantly, this amendment is there for every child who needs a helping hand, every child who needs the Federal Government to be a partner, so we can make sure these children meet their requirements. That is what this amendment does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. FRIST. I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in opposition to the Landrieu amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as a member of the authorizing committee, and as now chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee on education, we put two programs in here in 1994. One was the targeted program. That is fine. But then we also put in there what we call the education finance incentive grant, which is otherwise known as effort in equity. In other words, a lot of States that need targeted grants, their State governments are not doing enough to target their money towards the poorer school districts. So we added—not just targeted—but we added—effort and equity. We wanted to see what was the State doing to equalize the funding between the richest districts and poorest districts. So we added that in as a formula also. This

amendment only speaks to the targeted program and does nothing about effort and equity.

A 1998 GAO report found that Federal education programs provide an additional \$4.73 for each poor student for every dollar provided for all children. In contrast, States provided 62 cents for each poor child for every dollar provided for all children.

Senator LANDRIEU's amendment seeks to improve this record for the Federal dollars. We can always do better, but Federal dollars alone cannot correct the serious deficiency experienced by many low-income school districts. We must also encourage states to help these districts.

The Targeted Grant and the Education Finance Incentive Grant, in tandem, would be a more effective way of helping get additional resources to local school districts.

By funding the two grants, we accomplish two goals. First we do a better job of targeting Federal funds. Second, we also provide States with a modest incentive to also help poor schools. The Federal Government cannot do this job alone.

As we proceed to the appropriations bill in the next few months I would like to work with the Senator from Louisiana to accomplish our mutual goal of getting more resources to the poorest school districts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS (when his name was called). Mr. President, Mr. INOUE is necessarily absent. If he were to vote, he would vote "aye." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "no." I withhold my vote and announce a pair with the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is absent delivering a commencement address.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) would each vote "aye."

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

#### YEAS—57

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Baucus	Edwards	Miller
Bayh	Feingold	Murkowski
Bennett	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Graham	Reed
Byrd	Hatch	Reid
Cantwell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Carper	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hutchison	Schumer
Cleland	Kennedy	Sessions
Clinton	Kohl	Shelby
Conrad	Landrieu	Specter
Daschle	Leahy	Stabenow
Dayton	Levin	Torricelli
DeWine	Lieberman	Voinovich
Dodd	Lincoln	Wellstone
Domenici	McCain	Wyden

#### NAYS—36

Allard	Crapo	Lott
Allen	Ensign	Lugar
Bond	Enzi	McConnell
Brownback	Gramm	Nickles
Bunning	Grassley	Roberts
Burns	Hagel	Santorum
Campbell	Harkin	Smith (NH)
Carnahan	Helms	Snowe
Cochran	Inhofe	Thomas
Collins	Jeffords	Thompson
Corzine	Johnson	Thurmond
Craig	Kyl	Warner

#### PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR—1

Stevens

#### NOT VOTING—6

Biden	Gregg	Kerry
Durbin	Inouye	Smith (OR)

The amendment (No. 475) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. REID. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 405, WITHDRAWN

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 405 from the submitted amendments eligible for consideration to the bill, call up amendment 450, to modify my amendment, and to send my modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 450, AS MODIFIED, TO AMENDMENT NO. 358

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BREAUX, and Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 450, as modified.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 450) as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide Federal support through a new demonstration program to States and local educational agencies, to enable the States and agencies to develop models for high quality summer academic enrichment programs that are specifically designed to help public school students who are not meeting State-determined performance standards)

On page 778, strike line 21 and insert the following:

#### "PART C—STUDENT EDUCATION ENRICHMENT

##### "SEC. 6301. SHORT TITLE.

"This part may be cited as the 'Student Education Enrichment Demonstration Act'.

##### "SEC. 6302. PURPOSE.

"The purpose of this part is to establish a demonstration program that provides Federal support to States and local educational agencies to provide high quality summer academic enrichment programs, for public school students who are struggling academically, that are implemented as part of statewide education accountability programs.

##### "SEC. 6303. DEFINITION.

"In this part, the term 'student' means an elementary school or secondary school student.

##### "SEC. 6304. GRANTS TO STATES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a demonstration program through which the Secretary shall make grants to State educational agencies, on a competitive basis, to enable the agencies to assist local educational agencies in carrying out high quality summer academic enrichment programs as part of statewide education accountability programs.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—For a State educational agency to be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), the State served by the State educational agency shall—

"(1) have in effect all standards and assessments required under section 1111; and

"(2) compile and annually distribute to parents a public school report card that, at a minimum, includes information on student and school performance for each of the assessments required under section 1111.

##### "(c) APPLICATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a State educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

"(2) CONTENTS.—Such application shall include—

"(A) information describing specific measurable goals and objectives to be achieved in the State through the summer academic enrichment programs carried out under this part, which may include specific measurable annual educational goals and objectives relating to—

"(i) increased student academic achievement;

"(ii) decreased student dropout rates; or

"(iii) such other factors as the State educational agency may choose to measure; and

"(B) information on criteria, established or adopted by the State, that—

"(i) the State will use to select local educational agencies for participation in the summer academic enrichment programs carried out under this part; and

"(ii) at a minimum, will assure that grants provided under this part are provided to—

"(I) the local educational agencies in the State that—

"(aa) are serving more than 1 school identified for school improvement under section 1116(c); and



“(bb) have the highest percentages of students not achieving a proficient level of performance on State assessments required under section 1111;

“(II) local educational agencies that submit grant applications under section 6305 describing programs that the State determines would be both highly successful and replicable; and

“(III) an assortment of local educational agencies serving urban, suburban, and rural areas.

**“SEC. 6305. GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) FIRST YEAR.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the first year that a State educational agency receives a grant under this part, the State educational agency shall use the funds made available through the grant to make grants to eligible local educational agencies in the State to pay for the Federal share of the cost of carrying out the summer academic enrichment programs, except as provided in subparagraph (B).

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING ASSISTANCE.—The State educational agency may use not more than 5 percent of the funds—

“(i) to provide to the local educational agencies technical assistance that is aligned with the curriculum of the agencies for the programs;

“(ii) to enable the agencies to obtain such technical assistance from entities other than the State educational agency that have demonstrated success in using the curriculum; and

“(iii) to assist the agencies in planning activities to be carried out under this part.

“(2) SUCCEEDING YEARS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For the second and third year that a State educational agency receives a grant under this part, the State educational agency shall use the funds made available through the grant to make grants to eligible local educational agencies in the State to pay for the Federal share of the cost of carrying out the summer academic enrichment programs, except as provided in subparagraph (B).

“(B) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING ASSISTANCE.—The State educational agency may use not more than 5 percent of the funds—

“(i) to provide to the local educational agencies technical assistance that is aligned with the curriculum of the agencies for the programs;

“(ii) to enable the agencies to obtain such technical assistance from entities other than the State educational agency that have demonstrated success in using the curriculum; and

“(iii) to assist the agencies in evaluating activities carried out under this part.

“(b) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and containing by such information as the Secretary or the State may require.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The State shall require that such an application shall include, to the greatest extent practicable—

“(A) information that—

“(i) demonstrates that the local educational agency will carry out a summer academic enrichment program funded under this section—

“(I) that provides intensive high quality programs that are aligned with challenging

State content and student performance standards and that are focused on reinforcing and boosting the core academic skills and knowledge of students who are struggling academically, as determined by the State;

“(II) that focuses on accelerated learning so that students served through the program will master the high level skills and knowledge needed to meet the highest State standards or to perform at high levels on all State assessments required under section 1111;

“(III) that is based on, and incorporates best practices developed from, research-based enrichment methods and practices;

“(IV) that has a proposed curriculum that is directly aligned with State content and student performance standards;

“(V) for which only teachers who are certified and licensed, and are otherwise fully qualified teachers, provide academic instruction to students enrolled in the program;

“(VI) that offers to staff in the program professional development and technical assistance that are aligned with the approved curriculum for the program; and

“(VII) that incorporates a parental involvement component that seeks to involve parents in the program's topics and students' daily activities;

“(ii) may include—

“(I) the proposed curriculum for the summer academic enrichment program;

“(II) the local educational agency's plan for recruiting highly qualified and highly effective teachers to participate in the program; and

“(III) a schedule for the program that indicates that the program is of sufficient duration and intensity to achieve the State's goals and objectives described in section 6304(c)(2)(A); and

“(iii) shall include an explanation of how the local educational agency will develop and utilize individualized learning plans that outline the steps to be taken to help each student successfully meet that State's academic standards upon completion of the summer academic program;

“(B) an outline indicating how the local educational agency will utilize other applicable Federal, State, local, or other funds, other than funds made available through the grant, to support the program;

“(C) an explanation of how the local educational agency will ensure that only highly qualified personnel who volunteer to work with the type of student targeted for the program will work with the program and that the instruction provided through the program will be provided by qualified teachers;

“(D) an explanation of the types of intensive training or professional development, aligned with the curriculum of the program, that will be provided for staff of the program;

“(E) an explanation of the facilities to be used for the program;

“(F) an explanation regarding the duration of the periods of time that students and teachers in the program will have contact for instructional purposes (such as the hours per day and days per week of that contact, and the total length of the program);

“(G) an explanation of the proposed student/teacher ratio for the program, analyzed by grade level;

“(H) an explanation of the grade levels that will be served by the program;

“(I) an explanation of the approximate cost per student for the program;

“(J) an explanation of the salary costs for teachers in the program;

“(K) a description of a method for evaluating the effectiveness of the program at the local level;

“(L) information describing specific measurable goals and objectives, for each academic subject in which the program will provide instruction, that are consistent with, or more rigorous than, the annual measurable objectives for adequate yearly progress established by the State under section 1111;

“(M) a description of how the local educational agency will involve parents and the community in the program in order to raise academic achievement;

“(N) a description of how the local educational agency will acquire any needed technical assistance that is aligned with the curriculum of the agency for the program, from the State educational agency or other entities with demonstrated success in using the curriculum; and

“(O) a description of the supplemental educational and related services that the local educational agency will provide to students not meeting State academic standards and a description of the additional or alternative programs (other than summer academic enrichment programs) that the local educational agency will provide to students who continue to fail to meet State academic standards, after participating in such programs.

“(c) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this section, the State educational agency shall give priority to applicants who demonstrate a high level of need for the summer academic enrichment programs.

“(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost described in subsection (a) is 50 percent.

“(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost may be provided in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services.

**“SEC. 6306. SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**

“Funds appropriated pursuant to the authority of this part shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public or private funds expended to provide academic enrichment programs.

**“SEC. 6307. REPORTS.**

“(a) STATE REPORTS.—Each State educational agency that receives a grant under this part shall annually prepare and submit to the Secretary a report. The report shall describe—

“(1) the method the State educational agency used to make grants to eligible local educational agencies and to provide assistance to schools under this part;

“(2) the specific measurable goals and objectives described in section 6304(c)(2)(A) for the State as a whole and the extent to which the State met each of the goals and objectives in the year preceding the submission of the report;

“(3) the specific measurable goals and objectives described in section 6305(b)(2)(L) for each of the local educational agencies receiving a grant under this part in the State and the extent to which each of the agencies met each of the goals and objectives in that preceding year;

“(4) the steps that the State will take to ensure that any such local educational agency who did not meet the goals and objectives in that year will meet the goals and objectives in the year following the submission of the report or the plan that the State has for revoking the grant of such an agency and redistributing the grant funds to existing or new programs;

“(5) how eligible local educational agencies and schools used funds provided by the State educational agency under this part; and

"(6) the degree to which progress has been made toward meeting the goals and objectives described in section 6304(c)(2)(A).

"(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall annually prepare and submit to Congress a report. The report shall describe—

"(1) the methods the State educational agencies used to make grants to eligible local educational agencies and to provide assistance to schools under this part;

"(2) how eligible local educational agencies and schools used funds provided under this part; and

"(3) the degree to which progress has been made toward meeting the goals and objectives described in sections 6304(c)(2)(A) and 6305(b)(2)(L).

"(c) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding the demonstration program carried out under this part and the impact of the program on student achievement. The Comptroller General shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study.

**"SEC. 6308. ADMINISTRATION.**

"The Secretary shall develop program guidelines for and oversee the demonstration program carried out under this part.

**"SEC. 6309. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

"There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

**"SEC. 6310. TERMINATION.**

"The authority provided by this part terminates 3 years after the date of enactment of the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act."

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, let me begin by especially thanking two of our colleagues as we begin this debate about a part of this country's educational system that, unfortunately, has gotten short shrift. For the next few minutes we are going to talk about summer school, which I think is a critical time between the spring achievement tests that our youngsters take and that time in the fall when it is so critical to evaluate their performance for the upcoming school year.

Suffice it to say, what the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, and I would like to do is have an opportunity to supercharge those few months in an effort to beef up the test scores, particularly the test scores of math and science, for youngsters across this country.

What Senator SESSIONS and Senator DURBIN and I envision is establishing a new demonstration program that would empower States and local educational agencies to develop models for exceptionally high-quality summer academic enrichment programs that would be designed to help public school students meet those achievement requirements being required by the States in the performance standards that are being established.

For me, it all came down to what Nehemiah Vaughn told me in Portland not long ago when he was going into the sixth grade. Nehemiah Vaughn told me: Summer school, Mr. Senator, is helping me to raise my grades.

I think, as we look at educational reform in this country, we ought to think about what students and families are telling us. For example, in Baltimore—and we know our colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, has been very interested in these education issues—the Baltimore Sun had an exceptionally important article a few days ago indicating that more than 30,000 children—nearly one-third of Baltimore's public school population—had failed to meet the tough new promotion standards and were being directed to summer school.

So this legislation, which Senator SESSIONS and I have worked on for many months, on a bipartisan basis, with Senator DURBIN especially—and we are pleased to have Senator LANDRIEU, Senator BREAUX, and Senator MIKULSKI as bipartisan cosponsors—is an effort to develop these model projects around the country that can be duplicated in the years ahead.

We are not saying that we can spend an unlimited sum of money at this point, but we are saying that \$25 million is a modest amount of money to spend each year over the next few years to set in place these demonstration projects which we believe would then be projects that could be duplicated in school districts across this country.

For example, Senator DURBIN has done very important work with the Chicago program which is called the Public School Summer Bridge Program. I happen to share his view that it is going to take a substantial investment in the years ahead to strengthen these summer school programs.

Frankly, I would like to be able to invest a bit more in those programs now. I think it is critically important that one of those major urban school districts be part of the set of programs that are selected when these programs are evaluated by the experts in the field. So I want it understood that his contribution, in my view, is extremely important.

I also note the chairman of the committee, Senator KENNEDY, is with us. He has again and again and again raised these issues in this Senate Chamber. I think this country is very fortunate that someone is in this Chamber who consistently makes it impossible for the Senate to forget these priorities. I express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee as well for all of his help, and that of the staff.

Finally, I will yield to my colleague from Alabama. He and I have been talking about this effort for more than a year. I have always thought that the really important work for this country can only be accomplished on a bipartisan basis. I think it is clear that when we look at the future of education, it does not get much more important than summer school.

It is our hope, the hope of Senator SESSIONS and I, and Senator DURBIN,

that after we get the results of these demonstration projects—and we see what works and what is most cost effective—we can be in this Chamber again, on a bipartisan basis, making the case to our colleagues that these are the kinds of programs that are going to allow us to use those months, those precious months between the spring achievement tests and the fall, to make sure that when young people leave in the spring they say more than: See you in September; that they say: See you in summer school, and that they and their families know the programs that truly make a difference.

I yield the floor and especially thank my colleague, Senator SESSIONS, from Alabama who has worked with me on this for more than a year. And I also recognize the critically important work of Senator DURBIN.

I think when we get the results of these demonstration projects, you are going to see the bipartisan team that has advanced this demonstration project effort back in this Chamber again saying that now this country has to make a truly significant investment in summer school because these are programs that make a difference.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I join with Senator WYDEN in our concern that summer not be a vacuum for children. I have had, for quite a number of years, a deep concern that children are losing too much over the summer.

Every child perhaps does not need to go to summer school. I am not perfectly sure how it ought to work. But ultimately I think we have the question of whether or not we could do a better job in the summer.

We do know this. We do know that in an age where we are doing a better job of testing, we are finding that children are falling behind. We have seen some studies that indicate the normal summer school programs of today have not been very effective in helping those children who fall behind. So it strikes me as perfectly good sense and good public policy for the U.S. Government to be involved in helping to identify how education is occurring, where the problems are, and to do good scientific research to help our States and local school systems to best understand what is occurring and how they might, with frugal and wise use of their money, get the most learning possible by each and every child in a school system.

A few years ago, Senator FEINSTEIN and I offered a very serious amendment to end social promotion. Social promotion is a system where a child is clearly falling behind the minimum standards of education, yet they are passed on because people think that helps them socially.

Dr. Paige, the Secretary of Education, from the Houston school system became the superintendent of that school system when only 37 percent of the students were passing the Houston basic education test. He decided to make some serious changes. One of the changes he made was to end social promotion and to provide more incentives to help children who were falling behind. In 5 years, those passing that test went from 37 percent to 73 percent. This was in a huge 210,000-student system in Houston, TX, one of the largest school systems in America, facing all the problems that a big inner-city school system would face.

He took those tough positions because he loved those children. He did not want to see them just be passed along and not learn, to be not up to the level they needed to be, finally reaching a level in school where they were so far behind, they just dropped out. That is the pattern he said he saw and was determined to end, and he did a remarkable job when he was in Houston of ending that cycle.

The goal is for us to be a lot more serious about education. The goal has to be to have some change in education. Senator WYDEN is correct: We need to ask some of these questions. We need to know what is occurring in our school systems.

One of the things that is plain and simple is, perhaps if we can identify children who are falling behind in early grades and provide them with a high-quality, well-managed summer school program, we just may be able to achieve special results for those children. And then when they come back in September, instead of falling even further behind during the summer, they are up and ready to compete with the other children in that class.

One of the things I strongly believe is appropriate for the Federal Government to do is to do this kind of research. So we are going to have the Department of Education review these programs, these programs in each one of these pilot five States that will be selected. They will be required to submit intense data on what they have done and how they did it. We will have the General Accounting Office as an additional independent evaluator of these school systems.

Maybe when we look at them around the country, we can say: This clearly works, this is real progress; or, this did not show much good progress. We can use that information to challenge every school system in America to use the best available scientific evidence to plan a summer school program that works for every child and focuses not just on going through the motions of a summer school but actually bringing a child up who has fallen behind, getting them ready to start in the fall, motivating them with more confidence than they would have otherwise had.

I am honored to join Senator WYDEN on this legislation. We are starting the right way. It has the potential to provide us information that could be extraordinarily valuable. I thank him for his commitment and leadership. I thank Senator DURBIN, who also is strongly committed to summer school programs, for working with us on this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I thank Senators WYDEN and SESSIONS and others for bringing this amendment to the attention of the Senate. In a few moments, I will urge that the Senate accept the amendment.

I want to mention to the two sponsors a very interesting program we had in Boston last summer that was a result of the leadership provided by the Federal Reserve in Boston and the PIC and Tom Payzant, who is the superintendent of schools. What they did is provide, with the summer employment program of the mayors, 2 hours of reading for a 6-week period to students who the principals of various schools thought would have difficulty with what they call the MCAS, which is our sort of NAEP test, the principal test that is given statewide and the child cannot graduate unless that child is going to pass the test.

They had some 260 students who were involved in that program. The average progress that was made was 1.7 years. No student advanced less than a year, and many of them were at least 2 years or above. It was the combination of the school system working, in this case, with the PIC, which is a combination of the industries, in this case in Boston, really one of the best of the PICs that exist not only in our State but in the country, really outstanding leaders in the business community, the labor community, the education community, and the school system. They made it an objective to try to take the summer employment program and add the educational component to it.

This year they are going to have it for 460 students. That might not be the best one even for Springfield, MA, let alone for Seattle or Portland but, nonetheless, it is working. It is an innovative and creative way of trying to develop an education program that is also an employment program where in many instances these children need the employment in the summer as well as the educational program.

As I understand, you have sufficient flexibility in the development of this program to try to sort of challenge local communities to find ways in which you can enhance academic achievement in the course of the summer program. At least in Boston it works very well.

I was in a plane just last week talking to one of the stewardesses whose

family was located in North Carolina. The child was in one of the early grades and had not quite done as well as they should, just missed narrowly, and only had 5 days of a summer program. But the parents were very supportive of it. The child was rather excited about it because they were going to get caught up to the rest of the class.

The summer programs are here to stay, hopefully in ways that are going to reach out to children at the lower levels as well as children moving through the middle schools and high schools.

One of the things I find most appealing is the good amendment you pointed out to try to find out what is happening out there across the country, what is working, what is demonstrating good results. The summer is really going to be a key time in terms of helping children.

The last point I will make is that in looking at the country and trying to enhance education accomplishment, most educators would say, particularly for children who are hard-pressed, that the summer interlude is a dangerous time. Children fall behind. A lot of it is that they are sort of moving along, gradually making some progress. Then they run into the summertime, and they fall behind again; they have to start over again. So this summer period—trying to find ways in which they can have effective programs so children who may be behind a little bit can catch up, get some advantage, retain the knowledge they may have gained, get some advantage in making up for perhaps some other area of need—makes them better prepared in the next full period. All of this deserves our thought.

The good amendment is going to help us do some important work in this area. I thank the two Senators for their initiative and those the good Senators have referenced for their help as well.

If there is no further comment, I ask, what is the question before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 450, as modified.

The amendment (No. 450), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2001

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to join my distinguished colleagues, Senators LUGAR, LEAHY, HARKIN, DURBIN, and others, as well as Representative JO ANN EMERSON and Representative JIM MCGOVERN in the House, to speak in favor of the International Food For Education and Nutrition Act of 2001.

Mr. President, former Senators Bob Dole and Senator George McGovern developed the concept of this bipartisan bill last year. This legislation, which links food to education, is really brilliant in its simplicity, by making permanent an existing international school nutrition pilot program.

These two dedicated public servants, Senator Dole and Senator McGovern, worked tirelessly in the Senate in years past to feed needy children both in this country and around the world. Because of them and because of their leadership and their vision, millions and millions of children have received nutritious meals and an education. Through their efforts, they have given millions of children hope and a future.

Mr. President, nearly 30 years ago, on this Senate floor, Senator Bob Dole and Senator George McGovern formed a bipartisan coalition on matters that had to do with agriculture and domestic food assistance. They led the way in putting in place an expanded network of food stamps for the poor, school lunches and breakfast on a much wider scale, a supplementary feeding program for low-income pregnant and nursing mothers and their infants, and nutrition guidelines for the American people.

Indeed, Senators Dole and McGovern, through their words and their deeds, have demonstrated a deep and enduring commitment to children around the globe.

But there is still more to do—much more. Today, we still cannot understate the importance of school feeding programs in impoverished countries throughout this world. Currently, there are hundreds of millions of children worldwide who are not enrolled in school, in part because of hunger or malnourishment. We know if there is food at school, children will come, children will attend. The fact is that

school feeding programs can reach the poorest of the poor, providing necessary nutrition to children who often do not receive any other food throughout the entire day.

As a result, these programs have had a substantial and very positive impact on school enrollment levels and attendance. More and more children are going to school around the world, and more and more children are able to learn and become educated. With an education, a child has a future.

There is a very simplistic and important link between food and education. My wife, Fran, and I have seen it in our travels to Haiti. We have become good friends with Father Hagan—Tom Hagan—an American priest who works so very hard with the poorest of the poor in Haiti. One of the things that Father Hagan does, and is doing today, is making that link between food and education.

Father Tom waits until after the school year starts and he sees what children don't have the money, don't have the ability to enroll in school. He waits a couple weeks and then he opens up his school and takes those children in from the city of Port au Prince, the Cite Soleil, the poorest part of the city, the slum, and provides them with education. He not only provides them with education, he provides them with what for most of them is the only meal they will receive, the only food they will receive all day. So the food serves as sort of a magnet, but, at the same time, it gives these young children the nourishment they need so they can concentrate and study and they can learn.

Fran and I have seen it firsthand in Haiti. We have seen it in Nicaragua, we have seen it in other countries where people are working to make a difference.

What this bill does is put the Congress and this country on record as saying we are committed to doing this around the world. We want to work with other countries and the United States to lead by example. We cannot do this all ourselves, but we can provide the initial leadership.

The specific initiative we are introducing today advances and expands current feeding programs by establishing the International Food for Education and Nutrition Program. This new program will enable the U.S. Department of Agriculture to use funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities for use in global school feeding programs. These commodities then would be provided to private organizations for distribution in recipient countries throughout the world.

To facilitate enactment of these programs, our bill also would provide adequate funds for transportation and distribution costs associated with these efforts. It does no good to give food if you cannot get it distributed.

Our legislation stems from the 1-year pilot program I referenced a moment ago which Senators Dole and McGovern developed and the previous administration launched a year ago. Known as the Global Food for Education Initiative, this \$300 million pilot program provides nutritious meals to children in 38 countries.

Under the program, 14 private volunteer organizations, together with the United Nations World Food Program, are working to provide a free breakfast or free lunch to some 7 million schoolchildren in developing countries. Our legislation is a perfect complement to the current Public Law 480 title II emergency feeding program which helps nourish more than 40 million children and adults worldwide.

Let me highlight just one of the many success stories we have already seen with the current pilot program.

In Cameroon, for example, we are providing nutritious meals to more than 50,000 schoolchildren, helping to increase school enrollment by over 50 percent and cutting the dropout rate for girls to virtually zero. These findings are not unique. We find, for example, similar success stories in Vietnam and in Honduras.

Our bill will continue to build upon the initial success of the pilot project, and we will make this program permanent. By making it permanent, we can reach even more impoverished children and have a lasting, long-term effect on global educational development and work to eradicate childhood hunger.

Furthermore, the investment in international school feeding programs not only will help children in developing countries, but it also will, of course, benefit our U.S. farmers. The program provides our farmers with a steady opportunity to sell the goods they produce. This is definitely a win-win situation.

I look forward to continuing our work on this important initiative, and I urge my colleagues to join in support of our legislation.

#### JAMES BOATWRIGHT, A VALUED SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I take a moment on the Senate floor to state my sadness—and I am sure the sadness of many Senators—on the death of James Boatwright.

For all the years I have served in the Senate, James has worked in the Senate restaurant. He has been a friend of mine and to many of us. He has kept us informed and entertained with his stories about his golf game, his insights about life, and sports in general. He was a very real and valuable part of the Senate and he will be missed by all of us who knew him.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I yield.

Mr. REID. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Not only was he a fixture in the restaurant, but he retired once. The reason his retirement was curtailed is that he, as the gracious, good man he was, cosigned a note for someone, and that person didn't pay that note. Rather than his defaulting on the note, he came back to work, out of his retirement, so he could do the honorable thing and pay that debt of someone else. He was a good man. I am sorry. I did not know of his passing until just now, and I certainly will miss him in the Senate restaurant.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to detail a terrible crime that occurred June 13, 2001 in Santa Maria, CA. Michael "Mike" Barry stabbed a gay man, Chris Allen Madden, 32, to death. Mike Barry, 21, was charged with murder and committing a hate crime. Barry allegedly bragged to friends that he "killed a faggot."

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### EXECUTION OF TIMOTHY McVEIGH

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, on this day, my thoughts are with the victims of Timothy McVeigh, and with their families. I hope that the spectacle of these last few weeks, leading to this execution, has not caused them further pain. McVeigh was cowardly and cruel, and I shall not dwell upon his memory or indulge his desire to be seen as a martyr. I rise today to speak on his execution not because I wish to add to the burdens of this day, but because I do not want it said that those of us who oppose the death penalty stood silently by.

Today, the question we need to ask is not: Was McVeigh a despicable killer, of course he was.

Rather, the questions we should ask are these: Does the death penalty serve us and our best American ideals, does it always serve justice, is it administered fairly, is it sometimes imposed upon people who are innocent.

The records will note that the cause of McVeigh's death was homicide, the intentional killing of one human being by another. The execution of even this most notorious murderer should

prompt us anew to reconsider the idea of our government killing people in our name, and perhaps to begin to acknowledge the growing American belief that the time has come to stop and learn the answers to the questions that plague the death penalty, before we proceed with any further executions.

We have an opportunity to turn another way on the death penalty. The next scheduled federal execution is that of Juan Raul Garza. His execution has been stayed until June 19 in light of the questions raised about regional and racial disparities in the federal death penalty system.

But the Justice Department now has declared that it will not wait until those questions are answered by an ongoing National Institute of Justice study before proceeding with his execution. They have gone so far as to declare that there is no bias in the system, even though the study has not come close to completion. Until we are certain of the fairness of the process and these questions are resolved, Garza should not be executed in our name. That's the real and difficult test that President Bush and Attorney General Ashcroft must face in the next few days. On this day, I hope that they will turn to it in earnest.

#### THE 65TH INFANTRY DIVISION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to commend the dedication and courage of the members of the 65th Infantry Division of the United States Army who fought in World War II.

The 65th Infantry Division was activated on August 16, 1943 at Camp Shelby, Mississippi under Major General Stanley E. Reinhart. Like many newly formed divisions in 1943, the men of the 65th Division traveled to different bases training in preparation for their participation in the battles across Europe during World War II.

On January 10, 1945, the 65th Infantry Division departed New York, and they arrived in Le Havre, France on January 21, 1945. On March 9, 1945, the division assembled near Ennery to relieve the 26th Infantry Division, defending Saarlautern Bridgehead from Orscholz to Wadgassen.

On March 13, 1945, the 261st Infantry Regiment crossed the Saar River near Menningen to clear the German defenders near the town of Merzig. On March 17, 1945, the 261st Infantry Regiment cleared the heights south of Merzig, and took the town of Killingen the following day. The rest of the division fought its way out of the bridgehead as the 259th Infantry Regiment captured the town of Fraulautern and the 260th Infantry Regiment seized Saarlautern on March 19, 1945. Then, the division fought its way through the West Wall and captured the town of Neunkirchen on March 21, 1945. It then assembled

near Ottweiler for rest and rehabilitation.

After 10 days of rest, the 65th Infantry Division connected with the 6th Armored Division. Closing into the Schwabenheim area, the division crossed the Rhine River with both the 260th and 261st Infantry Regiments during the night of March 29, 1945. It attacked across the Fulda River on April 2 and reached the Reichensachsen-Langenhain line on April 3, 1945. There the two divisions split. The same day the 259th Infantry Regiment crossed the Werra River, and continued to the Greuzberg area on April 4, 1945. The division assaulted the town of Langensalza, which fell on April 6, 1945, but a German counterattack overran a battalion of the 261st Infantry Regiment at Struth on April 7, 1945. The division restored the situation with air support and went into reserve on April 8, 1945, moving to the town of Berka on April 10, 1945.

The division moved to the town of Waltershausen on April 11, 1945 and then onto Arnstadt. On April 17, 1945 it assembled in the town of Bamberg and attacked toward Altdorf with the 259th and 260th Infantry Regiments the next day. The town of Neumarkt was taken on April 23, 1945 and the division drove to the Rhine River against crumbling German resistance. The division established a bridgehead across the Danube River southwest of Regensburg despite strong opposition, especially against the 261st Infantry Regiment on April 26, 1945. The bridgehead was expanded allowing the 13th Armored Division to pass through. The 260th Infantry Regiment took Regensburg on April 27, 1945. The division followed the Armored Division and crossed the Isar River at Plattling on May 1, 1945.

The 261st Infantry Regiment reached the Inn River at Passau on May 2, 1945 and assaulted across it at the town of Neuhaus. The town of Passau fell the next day and the 261st Infantry Regiment reached the Enns River and overran the town of Enns. The division crossed the Enns River on May 6, 1945, and made contact with the advancing Soviet Army in the vicinity of Strengberg.

The 65th Infantry Division reached Austria on May 4, 1945 and remained in Austria, under Brigadier General John E. Copeland until disbanded on August 31, 1945. Two hundred and thirty three men of the 65th Infantry Division were killed in action. Nine hundred and twenty-seven men were wounded in action.

In August of this year, the members of the 65th Infantry Division will gather for their 48th annual reunion in Pennsylvania. During their reunion, the men will be honored for their service with the dedication of a monument stone by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge. The members of the 65th Infantry Division deserve this special

recognition for their service, and I am pleased to be able to commend them on the floor of the United States Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the list of the names of the members of the 65th Infantry Division.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Robert D. Ackerman; Cecil C. Adams; Leo Adams; William R. Agnew; Raymond A. Aja; Harold M. Almasi; William D. Almond; John F. Amm; Edward W. Anderson; W.C. "Hap" Arnold; Howard B. Aronow; Ernie Bacco; James R. Bailey; Robert Baretz; Vincent T. Bartell; Bernard H. Beckstedt; Roland A. Bencivenni; James C. Benson; Ernest K. Berg, Jr.; Robert M. Bergeron; Philip Bianco; Norbert J. Bischoff; Thomas P. Black; Camille G. Blair; Major General John Blatos; Carl A. Blim, Jr.; Sidney Bloombert; William L. Bock; Sylvester J. Bower; Patrick J. Bradley; Jake Brewer; Joe Briggs, Jr.; John Brooks; Robert L. Brown; Carlton Brownell; Sydney Bruskin; Richard Burdick; Joseph Cadenelli; Michael Calabrese; Ray Callanan; J.D. "Jerry" Camp; Herbert "Dave" Campbell.

Thomas Campbell; Dominick J. Cardenal; Richard A. Carson; John T. Cary; Bernie Cencimino; Frank S. Cerchia; Stanley B. Chisholm; Robert H. Chism; Demo Christopoulos; Milton Ciment; Tom Clark; William O. Clark; Troyce J. Cofer; Bernard L. Cohen; Sidney Cohen; Roy C. Collins; Bill Corwin; Arthur D. Cree; Frank Cudney; Warren F. Cummins; James B. Curry; Francis M. Curtis; Bernard Cutler; Richard Czaia; Harry Daab; Gordon Dailey; Robert W. Day; Joseph Demarco; James H. Dickerson; Fred Diese; Charles F. Dischert; James E. Dorris; David A. Dosser; William J. Douglas; Robert B. Drake; Noel F. Duncan; Harold Dykes; John R. Edwards; E. William Ellis; Lyle G. Eyer; Patrick Fallar; Leslie J. Fant; George R. Farneth; William "Bill" Farrell.

Seymour Feinstein; Sidney Felix; Francis J. Finnegan; Charles W. Flock; Allen D. Flood; Howard Ford; Raymond F. Freer; Walter H. Fremd; Wilbur French; Anthony J. Frioni; James E. Furlan; Anthony J. Gagliardo; Joseph P. Gavaghan; Harold German; William E. Gibson; Tom Giggy; Jimmie Giles; Guido Girolami; Weldon C. Gold; Joe Gonzalez; Bernard Goodman; S.R. (Sanford) Gorin; Melvin E. Gorssman; Major G. W. Grant; Malcolm K. Grant; Harry J. Grimaldi; Charles Grof; Harry H. Gross; Allard L. Gustafson; Kenneth N. Hall; Mark W. Hannon; Maynard B. Hanson; Alvin E. Harris; Albert E. Harrop; Dan O. Harvill; William F. Hase; Robert W. Hellriegel; Robert Henager; Lynn Henneman; William F. Hennings; Richard Hennrick; Ray Henry; Clyde E. Hergert; John S. Hickey; Everette Hilfiker; Tommie Hill.

Theda Hollenbaugh; Luverne V. Hornbeck; Cliff Huffnagle; Douglas O. Hukkanen; Richard D. Hurley; Harold Hyde; Elbert Jackson; Robert Jacobson; Royce Jarrell; Mort Jenkins; Robert Jensen; C.A. Johannes; Finnis E. Jolly; Curtis B. Jones; Tommie Justice; Robert L. Kaiser; Milton Kaplan; Norman Kaplan; Richard Karon; Donald E. Keebler; Keith Kingsley; John K. Kirn; Burton Knowlton; Fred B. Kohl; Joseph Koosman; Hank Kulwicki; Jack R. Kurschner; Lynn M. LaBarre; Tommy A. Larned; Dante A. Laudi; John B. Law; Richard R. Lee; David Leshner; Ed Lewis; "Dick" Laurie O. Lieberg; William Linley; Lou Liss; Ronald E. Locke; Sanford Lockspeiser; Ray Long; Harold Low; Jay W. Lowry; Buford Lunsford; Thomas Mahovich;

Daniel O. Mallory; Chuck Manausa; Albert Mancinelli; Lionel C. Marcus.

Joseph F. Marino; Jack C. Martin; William R. Martindale; William D. Mason; John R. Massey; Jack W. Maxedon; Michael J. McCarthy; William E. McCloskey; John McClung; Norvin D. McClure; Jack C. McDermott; Harry McLinden; Charles Meany; William J. Mearls; Henry E. Medler; William H. Melton; William B. Meyer; Leroy O. Miller; William "Ben" Miller; Richard C. Minick; Edwin F. Mitesser; Thomas B. Montgomery; A.J. Morando; Fernando Moreno; S.L. (Ben) Morfino; Robert Morgenweck; Pellon Morris; Thomas D. Morrissey; Thomas E. Morton; Earl O. Moser; Charles Mote; John A. Moulder.

David Myers; Charles E. Myles; Ernest E. Nagy; Thomas D. Nash; Henry W. Nilges; Jim Nolan; Louis A. Nordone; Raymond B. Northfield; Duane E. Noyes; Chester A. Ogle; Gale K. O'Hair; Ronald V. Ordway; Joseph Oriente; Leonard F. Owczarzak; Wayne L. Palmer; Charles Pappas; John L. Parker, Sr.; Robert Parman; Lyle J. Parnie; Robert F. Patton; Keith Perkins; Ed Petsuch; Frank A. Peterchak; Jay Piccinati; Max W. Pierce; Wallace Pink; Woodrow Plant; Walter E. Plants; Merritt A. Plantz; Harry Polche; George Polizio; Kenneth O. Polzin, Sr.; Arthur T. Priester; E.F. "Gene" Proffitt, Jr.; Newburn "Buck" Pryor; Clifford Ratliffe; Doyle Ream.

George W. Reed; George Regelski; Russell Rego; Alvin C. Rehkop; Max G. Rein; Joseph Resende; Donald C. Rhodes; Charles R. Rigby; Fred W. Rindhage; James E. Roberts; Joseph Rodino; Edmund H. Rogers, Jr.; Paul W. Roman; Victor Roper; William G. Roth; Lawrence H. Rouse; Edward W. Ruffin; Dean A. Ruggeberg; Edward A. Runyan; Joseph Russell; Thomas P. Ryan; William B. Sabey; Marvin Sadur; Ted L. Saks; Stan Sandage; W.B. "Sandy" Sanders; Anthony H. Santulli; Frank J. Sarnacki; Sgt. Kenneth F. Sass; Rollin C. Schaffer; Ralph Schenkel; Thomas C. Searle; Leo Serian; Peter J. Sferrazza; David Shaeffer; Dean Shepherd; James M. Shook; Thomas J. Shorte; Owen Shutt, Jr.; Edward E. Slettom; Joseph Smiroldo; Ira J. Smith, Jr.; Lawrence Smith, Jr.; Richard J. Smith; Thomas J. Smith; William Davis Smith; William L. Smith; Philip J. Somerville.

Paul A. St. Jean; Harry C. Starkey; Robert C. Steger, Jr.; Benjamin B. Stout; John T. Strashinsky; Meyer Strumwasser; Jesse C. Stultz; Thomas E. Stumpff; Charles H. Sullivan; Robert C. Sullivan; Don D. Tague; Joseph M. Taillefer, Jr.; Thomas E. Tappan; Bruce L. Tegeler; Fred Tegeler; James E. Thomas; Henry L. Thompson; Jack L. Thurman; Sal H. Torre; Jack W. Townes; John V. Tuidar; Robert H. Tyrie; Robert D. Upp; Donald Van Hooser; Joseph Vance; Bobby J. Vandergriff; Robert J. Venner.

Elton R. Vice; Robert Vohwinkel; Robert Vonachen; Lester Wagner; Ralph G. Walczak; Walter R. Waldron; Leonard E. Warner; Edwin H. Wessell; Richard C. Wheat; Albert F. Wheeler; Lawrence W. White; Alfred H. Wickstrom; Ralph R. Wiederhold; Grady Wigley; Charles H. Williams; Robert Willner; Robert Wilson; Norman Winiker; Robert Winkle; Walter J. Wojnar; Calvin L. Wood; Robert L. Worley; Roy (Bradley) Wright; Calvin "Ray" Yordy; Leo Zelkowsky; Jack Zinnaman; and William Zupan.

#### AGING INTERDICTION FLEETS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to draw continued attention to our important narcotic interdiction ef-

forts throughout the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific, commonly referred to as the "Transit Zone," and the aging condition of the aircraft and vessels in both the U.S. Customs Service and U.S. Coast Guard fleet inventories.

Earlier this year, the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control held a hearing on the Transit Zone. Intelligence sources estimate that the annual cocaine flow through the six million square-mile Transit Zone is in excess of 500 metric tons. Non-commercial maritime conveyances account for more than 80 percent of this Transit Zone flow, and unfortunately, the estimated success rate for smugglers "go-fast" deliveries is close to 90 percent.

The U.S. Coast Guard operates numerous ships and aircraft that are aging and now require excessive maintenance to keep them in operation. Because these assets lack current technology, they are extremely manpower intensive, and require constant maintenance, which detracts from readiness and increases life cycle costs. All of the Coast Guard's 210-foot and 378-foot ships are at least 30 years old, and the Coast Guard even operates 3 "Mature class" cutters, WWII-era vessels inherited from the U.S. Navy. The Coast Guard's fleet of medium and high endurance cutters is older than 37 of the world's 39 similar naval fleets, and the majority of major Coast Guard ships and aircraft will reach the end of their predicted service lives by the year 2008.

The Customs Service operates a wide range of aircraft at 11 air branches and 10 air units throughout the country, as well as at 3 overseas forward operating locations (FOLs) and 2 sites in Mexico. The Customs Service has 142 aircraft and 196 vessels, and many are in need of modernization or replacement. The average age of their C-12 aircraft is 22 years old and all 16 of their UH-60 Blackhawks are "A" models (first production series) on loan from the U.S. Army. As their P-3 aircraft fleet has aged, numerous corrosion and cracking problems have been discovered. It is the P-3 aircraft that has become the backbone of our detection and monitoring system. But, the U.S. Customs Service Air and Maritime Interdiction (AMID) January 2001 Strategic Assessment reported, the level of aviation operations is insufficient to meet the current agency requirements of Presidential Decision Directive (PDD-14), the National Drug Control Strategy, and Plan Colombia.

While both services begin to feel the debilitating effects of these aging assets, demands for both the Customs Service and Coast Guard's unique services are simultaneously increasing. A doubling world population, the continued decline in marine fisheries, the end of the Cold War, the doubling of commercial passenger enplanements by 2009, the continuing scourge of illegal drugs and human smuggling, and the



tripling of international commerce are all expected to increase the nation's reliance on these agencies. The Customs Service will continue to be on the front lines on trade and economic growth, border security, counter terrorism, narcotics interdiction, financial crimes and money laundering, pornography, and Internet cybercrime cases. The Coast Guard will continue as the lead federal agency in the maritime environment with respect to drugs, illegal immigration, and fisheries law enforcement. We are increasing our demands, we are expanding our expectations, but we are not investing in our capability. We cannot continue to live off our principal and expect to achieve results.

The recent record maritime seizure of 13 tons of cocaine on a vessel in the Eastern Pacific only serves to highlight the significant Transit Zone threat and reinforces the urgent need for modernization of the U.S. Customs Service and the U.S. Coast Guard fleets. I urge my colleagues to continue to support our Nation's counterdrug efforts, including those in the Transit Zone and at our borders, and in support of these two important U.S. agencies.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, June 8, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,679,727,774,591.76, five trillion, six hundred seventy-nine billion, seven hundred twenty-seven million, seven hundred seventy-four thousand, five hundred ninety-one dollars and seventy-six cents.

One year ago, June 8, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,644,929,000,000, five trillion, six hundred forty-four billion, nine hundred twenty-nine million.

Twenty-five years ago, June 8, 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$608,283,000,000, six hundred eight billion, two hundred eighty-three million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion, \$5,071,444,774,591.76, five trillion, seventy-one billion, four hundred forty-four million, seven hundred seventy-four thousand, five hundred ninety-one dollars and seventy-six cents during the past 25 years.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### HEBREW ORPHAN SOCIETY CELEBRATES 200TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the Hebrew Orphan Society of Charleston, SC has a long, rich history that deserves to be celebrated. On June 24, a reception and dinner will be held at Charleston's Middleton Place Gardens in honor of the society's 200 years of good works. Founded in 1801 by a small group of Jewish men at K.K. Beth Elohim synagogue, the society flourished in culturally and religiously tol-

erant 19th-century Charleston. Its members reached out to widows and their families and to Jewish youth who could not afford a proper education. Membership was initially limited to 18, or "chai," the number representing life in the Jewish faith, but has now doubled and includes women as well as men with a distinguished record of service in the Jewish community and the larger Charleston community. Today, the society assists Social Services clients with transportation and medical bills and meets requests from Hospice and Jenkins Orphanage in North Charleston. A quiet, yet diligent effort by The Hebrew Orphan Society may often go unnoticed by the public. However, rest assured of the many grateful citizens throughout history who have experienced its munificence. My wife, Peatsy, and I send The Hebrew Orphan Society our heartfelt congratulations on this milestone and best wishes in the years ahead.●

#### TRIBUTE TO GLEN TAIT

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to commend my Legislative Director, Glen Tait, who is leaving my employ for other opportunities outside the Senate. He has been an integral part of my staff since I was elected to the Senate, and his absence will be greatly noted. Glen's involvement in the Senate dates back more than a decade, much of it spent in service to the State of Idaho. Prior to coming to work for me, he worked for my predecessor, Dirk Kempthorne, so he truly has become an adopted Idahoan.

Glen has headed up my legislative efforts since I was first elected, and has provided invaluable guidance and direction for my legislative staff. He is particularly knowledgeable about military and energy issues, both of which hold significant importance to the State of Idaho. Mountain Home Air Force Base and the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory owe a great debt to his expertise and ability. Glen has strong insight into the legislative processes of the Senate and served as a mentor to a number of staffers, who have taken that knowledge and used it to help improve their career options.

Glen's wife tells me that he will miss working directly for the people of Idaho, and we will miss him tremendously as well. But he will have a constant reminder of the State in at least one of his two daughters. Glen and his lovely wife, Jeanette, have two young toddlers at home, Lindsey Marie and Hailey Madison. Hailey was named for the town of the same name in Idaho, and for the county in Idaho in which she was born. I wish him the very best and want him to know how much I appreciate the stability and guidance he provided to a fledgling Senate legislative staff several years ago. My best

wishes go out to him as he moves on to other opportunities.●

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

• Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate another class from Lincoln High School in Portland, OR, competing in the national finals of the program "We the People . . . The Citizens and the Constitution". This April, students from Lincoln High School placed third among 49 classes in this national competition. I had the great pleasure of meeting these impressive young people while they were visiting the Capitol, and I am very proud of their efforts. I know that they worked diligently to reach the national finals, demonstrating a remarkable understanding of the principles and values that support our constitutional government.

The "We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution" program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The three-day national competition is modeled after hearings in the United States Congress, consisting of oral presentations by high school students before a panel of adult judges. The student testimony is followed by a period of questioning during which the judges probe students for their depth of understanding and ability to apply their constitutional knowledge.

It is extremely important that our young people come to understand and appreciate the unique concepts and values which have guided our Nation since its inception. These are the young leaders who must guide our country's future, and their wisdom must be equal to our country's need. Again, I congratulate the student team from Lincoln High School and thank each member for their dedication, hard work, and enthusiasm.

The student team from Lincoln High School consists of: Brett Bell; Michael Blank; Ben Brewer; Chris Chamness; Greg Damis-Wulff; Alex Dewar; David Dickey-Griffith; Heather Dunlap; Jenni Hamni; Jennifer Hill; Scott Huan; Nick Johnson; Kathayoon Khalil; Cali Lanza-Weil; Jenelle Milam; Jonathan Pulvers; Julie Rhew; Katie Rose; Andrew Rosenthal; Anay Shah; Chris Shay; Rafael Spielman; Jason Trombley; Jessica Vandermeer; Oliver Vandermeer; Ben Walsh; Colleen Wearn; and with their teacher, Jennifer Vaught.●

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:



By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1009. A bill to require the provision of information to parents and adults concerning bacterial meningitis and the availability of a vaccination with respect to such diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1010. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1011. A bill to provide the financial mechanisms, resource protections, and professional skills necessary for high quality stewardship of the National Park System and to recognize the importance of high quality outdoor recreational opportunities on federally managed land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1012. A bill to ensure that children at highest risk for asthma, vision, hearing, and other health problems are identified and treated; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LOTT) (by request):

S.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Finance.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 77

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 77, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect consumers in managed care plans and other health coverage.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to require the Federal Communications Commission to fulfill the sufficient universal service support requirements for high cost areas, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 to allow as a deduction in determining adjusted gross income the deduction for expenses in connection with services as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, to allow employers a credit against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserve components, and to allow a comparable credit for participating reserve component self-employed individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 543

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 543, a bill to provide for equal coverage of mental health benefits with respect to health insurance coverage unless comparable limitations are imposed on medical and surgical benefits.

S. 561

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 561, a bill to provide that the same health insurance premium conversion arrangements afforded to Federal employees be made available to Federal annuitants and members and retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 666

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the use of completed contract method of accounting in the case of certain long-term naval vessel construction contracts.

S. 672

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 672, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the continued classification of certain aliens as children for purposes of that Act in cases where the aliens "age-out" while awaiting immigration processing, and for other purposes.

S. 710

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 710, a bill to require coverage for colorectal cancer screenings.

S. 724

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 724, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of pregnancy-related assistance for targeted low-income pregnant women.

S. 781

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator

from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 781, a bill to amend section 3702 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority for housing loans for members of the Selected Reserve.

S. 839

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 839, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment for inpatient hospital services under the medicare program and to freeze the reduction in payments to hospitals for indirect costs of medical education.

S. 871

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 871, a bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the computation of annuities for air traffic controllers in a similar manner as the computation of annuities for law enforcement officers and firefighters.

S. 994

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 994, a bill to amend the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 to extend authorities under that Act.

S. 1006

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to provide for the energy security of the United States and promote environmental quality by enhancing the use of motor vehicle fuels from renewable sources, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 71

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 71, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the need to preserve six day mail delivery.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 99, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Olympics.

S. CON. RES. 3

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 3, a concurrent resolution

expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* and all those who served aboard her.

S. CON. RES. 11

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 11, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to fully use the powers of the Federal Government to enhance the science base required to more fully develop the field of health promotion and disease prevention, and to explore how strategies can be developed to integrate lifestyle improvement programs into national policy, our health care system, schools, workplaces, families and communities.

S. CON. RES. 43

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 43, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the Republic of Korea's ongoing practice of limiting United States motor vehicles access to its domestic market.

AMENDMENT NO. 424

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 424.

AMENDMENT NO. 475

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 475.

AMENDMENT NO. 476

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 476.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. VOINOVICH):

S. 1009. A bill to require the provision of information to parents and adults concerning bacterial meningitis and the availability of a vaccination with respect to such diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator VOINOVICH to offer legislation on a health issue that is very important to parents across the Nation.

Bacterial meningitis affects 3,000 people across the United States each year. Approximately 10 to 13 percent of patients with bacterial meningitis die despite receiving antibiotics early in the disease. Of those individuals who survive, an additional 10 percent have severe aftereffects of the disease, including mental retardation, hearing loss, and loss of limbs.

My bill would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control, to develop and make available information about bacterial meningitis. In addition, it would make available information about the availability and the effectiveness of bacterial meningitis vaccinations for children and adults.

To help prevent these needless deaths, the bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide this information to a list of institutions, including child care centers, schools, universities, boarding schools, summer camps, detention facilities, and, as determined appropriate by the Secretary any other entity that provides housing in a dorm-like setting. This information in turn would be provided to both children and adults.

This will allow parents and others to be more informed about this dangerous disease and encourage them to obtain appropriate vaccines.

I commend the Senator from Ohio for his support on this issue and urge other Senators to join us in this effort.

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1010. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1010

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project number 11437, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the requirements of that section and the Commission's procedures under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the project for 3 consecutive 2-year periods.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) takes effect on the date of the expiration of the extension issued by the Commission before the date of the enactment of this Act under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806).

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. AKAKA):

S. 1011. A bill to provide the financial mechanisms, resource protections, and professional skills necessary for high quality stewardship of the National Park System and to recognize the importance of high quality outdoor rec-

reational opportunities on federally managed land; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, John Muir, the founder of the Sierra Club once said, "Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people are beginning to find out that going to the mountains is going home; that wilderness is a necessity; and that mountain parks and reservations are useful not only as fountains of timber and irrigating rivers, but as fountains of life."

As our society becomes increasingly removed from the natural world, this prescient statement rings ever more true.

Americans are becoming increasingly aware of the opportunities that our national parks provide for us to reconnect with the magnificent natural heritage of our country. The number of visits to national parks is soaring, as is use of their diverse resources. While this is good news in many ways, it has created a peculiar problem.

We are loving our parks to death.

Today, I am joined by my colleague Senator AKAKA to introduce the National Parks Stewardship Act of 2001. This legislation endeavors to address some of the most serious problems facing the national parks system today.

First, the National Parks Stewardship Act ensures that activities in parks and on Federal lands adjacent to parks are compatible with the conservation and preservation of natural, cultural, and historical resources. This legislation also requires the proper preservation of historic documents, records, and artifacts, including resources in marine environments which may require specialized skills for their maintenance.

The National Parks Stewardship Act also helps the Park Service plan for the future by studying visitation and demographic patterns and preparing for an increasingly diverse and growing population.

Second, this legislation provides innovative financing tools to help fund operations and maintenance and to address the current maintenance backlog. Specifically, the National Parks Stewardship Act proposes a non-appropriated funds instrumentalities program and challenge cost share projects.

In addition, the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program would be permanently established with the requirement that certain percentages of the revenues generated remain available to the park at which they were collected. A system of signs would also be established to let park visitors know how recreation fees are spent and which projects have been completed as a result of this program.

Finally, the National Parks Stewardship Act establishes a pilot program called Professionals for Parks. This program would enable the Park Service to recruit prospective employees who

have completed graduate-level administration and business management programs. Furthermore, this legislation creates a student loan payment program to entice quality employees to bring their expertise to the Park Service.

I believe that the Park Service and our national parks are beginning a new era. Visits to and enjoyment of our parks will continue to increase, and we must enable the Park Service to keep pace with this trend. We must encourage sound management of our parks and the vast natural and cultural resources they safeguard. We must also encourage opportunities for new ways to fund increasing operations and maintenance costs. Finally, we must encourage our national parks to represent a growing and increasingly diverse population. The National Stewardship Act starts us along that path.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1012. A bill to ensure that children at highest risk for asthma, vision, hearing, and other health problems are identified and treated; to the Committee on Finance.

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Healthy Children Learn Act with my colleague from Maine, Senator COLLINS. This legislation is focused on eliminating some bureaucratic barriers that make it more difficult for schools to provide their students with health care services, if they so choose.

Many schools have found that the health of a child can significantly affect his or her ability to learn. To enhance children's learning ability and to increase the well-being of their students, these schools sometimes choose to provide health care service including health care screenings.

One example of a disease that significantly affects children's education is asthma. Asthma is the single greatest reason for school absenteeism today. Over five million children in America suffer from asthma. 49 percent of children with asthma missed school in the last year and 48 percent of children with asthma are limited in sports and recreation. Lack of physical activity in turn can lead to childhood obesity with its concomitant health care problems.

"America is in the middle of an asthma epidemic—an epidemic that is getting worse, not better." So says the PEW Environmental Health Commission in its most recent report on asthma. The prevalence of asthma continues to rise at astounding rates, in every region of the country and across all demographic groups, whether measured by age, race or sex.

My home State of Illinois has some of the highest rates of childhood asthma in the country. Unfortunately, Chicago has the highest childhood asthma-related death rate in the Nation. Over

60 percent of childhood admissions to the emergency room in Chicago are for asthma. This disease exacts a very significant toll on children in my State.

For the next 15 minutes, imagine breathing through a tiny straw the size of a coffee stirrer, never getting enough air. Now imagine suffering through the process three to six times a day. This is asthma. Can a child really concentrate on learning, when he or she is gasping for air?

Due to the very high rates of asthma in Chicago and the effects it has on absenteeism and children's ability to learn when at school, the Chicago Public Schools, (CPS), have instituted a new asthma screening program. At the beginning of this program, they estimated that at least 40,000 undiagnosed or under-diagnosed cases of asthma existed among their students. The school system developed an asthma manual to provide a standard plan of care for all students with asthma. They provided citywide nurse training so as to develop a uniform, high standard for approaching students with asthma and their parents and high-quality education about the environmental triggers for asthma and how to lessen them, together with education on how to use asthma inhalers. In 1999, they identified 12,374 cases of asthma. CPS continues to monitor and evaluate this program. They have also partnered with other organizations such as the American Red Cross Asthma Program, the University of Chicago and the Chicago Department of Public Health Asthma Programs. CPS has also developed parent tutoring programs and has linked asthmatic children with primary health care providers for appropriate follow-up.

All of these efforts are extremely important but they are resource intensive. While the majority of the children in the Chicago Public Schools system are eligible for Medicaid or the State Children's Health Insurance Program, the payment rules for Medicaid make it more difficult for CPS to get reimbursed for health screenings. These barriers should be removed. Schools that make the extra effort to provide their students health care services should be adequately reimbursed. When they provide Medicaid-eligible children with Medicaid-covered services, they should receive appropriate reimbursement for those services. Likewise for the S-CHIP program reimbursement should be available for covered services for children enrolled or eligible for the program.

This legislation goes further and provides for a \$10 million grant program for school districts such as CPS to apply for funds for asthma screening for those children who are not eligible for either S-CHIP or Medicaid. The grants would be targeted to those districts that have the highest prevalence or deaths associated with asthma. The

legislation addresses a barrier to children receiving vital health screenings in schools.

CPS has also found that children's ability to learn is affected by impaired vision and hearing. Children with vision deficits are far more likely to fail academically. In 1998, CPS found that children who were retained failed their school-based vision screening at a rate 50 percent higher than children who were not failing. Likewise, children who have difficulty hearing struggle with language development, social processes and communication. This can seriously impair all aspects of the educational process. For example, children in Grade 1 with a 25 decibel hearing loss have a reading and grade equivalence of 2.0 compared to children without such a loss who on average score 2.3 on the same test. Through these programs, CPS has provided over 5,000 free eye exams, and 4,000 free pairs of glasses have been dispensed. They currently are reimbursed less than 40 percent of the cost of the vision and hearing screenings.

To address some of these funding shortfalls, this legislation creates a \$10 million grant program for vision and hearing screening and clarifies Medicaid payment rules so that schools can be reimbursed when they provide a Medicaid covered service to a Medicaid child.

No child should have his or her education threatened by the lack of effective screening to diagnose these health problems. In each case, treatments or corrective devices are available to help children and we should see to it that the children receive them where necessary. The Healthy Children Learn Act will help children get the health care services they need so that they can get the educational opportunities they deserve.●

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LOTT) (by request):

S.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce legislation that would implement a long-awaited bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam. This agreement marks another step in the long road toward normalizing relations between our two nations. When we pass this and other important trade legislation, we send the signal that we, as a Nation, are committed to engaging with countries around the globe by using our mutual interests as a foundation for working through our differences. By fully implementing this agreement, Vietnam will also send a clear message that it is interested in continuing, and completing, a process of reform and modernization of its economy and institutions.

The Clinton administration signed the bilateral agreement with Vietnam on July 13, 2000, after nearly four years of meticulous negotiations. Under terms of the agreement, Vietnam will reduce tariffs on approximately 250 products, about four-fifths of which are agricultural products. My own State of South Dakota will be among the beneficiaries of Vietnam's market opening commitments. As the second-largest producer of sunflower seeds, our farmers will no doubt benefit from the slash in duty on this product from the current level of 30 percent to 10 percent. Exporters of soybeans, furthermore, will see the rates drop by half, to only 5 percent.

In addition to the significant reduction in tariffs on agricultural and industrial products, the agreement opens Vietnam to American financial, banking and telecommunications services. While the agreement does not make Vietnam a member of the World Trade Organization, WTO, a number of its provisions bring Vietnam one step closer to compliance with WTO accords. Specifically, Vietnam has committed to abide by WTO standards regarding customs procedures, import licensing requirements and phytosanitary measures. In addition, Vietnam has also agreed to follow WTO agreements on intellectual property rights, which protect American copyrights, patents and trademarks. The same can be said for regulations involving American investment there. Hopefully, passage of this bilateral agreement will add momentum to Vietnam's bid for full membership in the global trading body.

The United States, in return, has promised to grant Vietnam normal trade relations, NTR. The practical effect of this action would be that products imported from Vietnam would now be subject to the same level of tariffs as products from almost every other country in the world. Vietnamese companies would no longer face significant tariff barriers to our market. The agreement does include, however, a safeguard provision to prevent a surge in Vietnamese imports from injuring our own domestic industries.

The implementing resolution introduced today would fulfill our obligation to grant Vietnam normal trade relations. Under this legislation, however, Vietnam's trading status would still be subject to annual Congressional review. The legislation is in no way a permanent extension of such treatment. This is due to the so-called Jackson-Vanik provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, which allow for an annual review by Congress of an extension of normal trade relations to any non-market economy country, such as Vietnam.

Specifically, the Jackson-Vanik amendment mandates that a non-market economy country's access to American markets is conditioned on their

completion of a bilateral commercial agreement with the United States and their policies on freedom of emigration. According to the statute, a non-market economy country like Vietnam must sign an agreement with the United States extending nondiscriminatory treatment to our products. In other words, they must grant normal trade relations to the United States. Access to our markets is further contingent on their policies on freedom of emigration. If the President determines that such policies meet certain standards, or that a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik provisions would, in fact, encourage further liberalization of their emigration policies, only then can the United States grant these countries normal trade relations.

President Clinton first waived Jackson-Vanik provisions with respect to Vietnam in 1998 on the basis that such action would promote further liberalization of its emigration policies. The waiver has been extended every year since then. But since Vietnam does not currently have a bilateral agreement with the United States, and therefore does not receive normal trade relations, the waiver simply allows for the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC, and the U.S. Export-Import Bank to support U.S. businesses exporting to and/or operating there. The legislation I am introducing today would grant normal trade relations to Vietnam, meeting the second requirement of Jackson-Vanik, and therefore allow the market opening agreement to take effect.

The Presidential waiver of Vietnam's treatment under Jackson-Vanik has never been disapproved by Congress. In fact, support for the waiver has grown substantially in both chambers. Last year, for instance, 330 members of the House voted in favor of the waiver's extension and a bill disapproving the President's waiver was voted down by 94 Senators. I am confident that such action indicates strong support by Members of Congress for passage of this agreement.

I am encouraged that President Bush has sent the agreement to Congress for final approval. Indeed, last month, I signed a letter urging him to do so as soon as possible. This is an important agreement, and today we are taking the first step towards swift Senate consideration.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 795. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 723, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell generation and research; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SA 796. Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 723, supra; which was referred

to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 795.** Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 723, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell generation and research; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROHIBITION ON MIXING HUMAN AND ANIMAL GAMETES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GAMETE.—The term "gamete" means a haploid germ cell that is an egg or a sperm.

(2) SOMATIC CELL.—The term "somatic cell" means a diploid cell whose nucleus contains the full set of chromosomes of a human or an animal.

(b) PROHIBITION.—It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly attempt to create a human-animal hybrid by—

(1) combine a human gamete and an animal gamete; or

(2) conducting nuclear transfer cloning using a human egg or a human somatic cell nucleus.

(c) SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates subsection (b) shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

(2) CIVIL PENALTIES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate regulations providing for the application of civil penalties to persons who violate subsection (b).

**SA 796.** Mr. BROWNBACK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 723, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell generation and research; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PROHIBITION ON EXPORTATION OF HUMAN EMBRYOS.

The Secretary of Commerce shall prohibit the export (as such term is defined in section 16 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App 2415)) from the United States of any human embryo or part thereof.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, June 19, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 764, a bill to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to impose just and reasonable load-differentiated demand rates

or cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market, and for other purposes; and sections 508-510, relating to wholesale electricity rates in the western energy market, natural gas rates in California, and the sale price of bundled natural gas transactions, of S. 597, the Comprehensive and Balanced Energy Policy Act of 2001.

Those wishing to submit written statements on these bills should address them to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Leon Lowery at (202) 224-4103.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL  
RESOURCES

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, June 20, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the hearing is to consider the nominations of: Patricia Lynn Scarlett to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior (for Policy, Management and Budget); William Gerry Myers III to be the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior; and Bennett William Raley to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior (for Water and Science).

Those wishing to submit written statements on a nomination should ad-

dress them to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Leon Lowery at (202) 224-4103.

---

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Maria Purdy be granted the privilege of the floor during the debate on amendment No. 475.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 12,  
2001

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. Tuesday, June 12. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, if necessary, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 1, the education authorization bill. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, on Tuesday, the Senate will convene at 9:30 a.m. and resume consideration of the education authorization bill. The Senate will consider immediately the Gregg amendment regarding vouchers under a 4-hour time agreement. Following disposition of the Gregg amendment, the Senate will consider the Carper amendment regarding public school choice under a 2-hour time agreement. Additional rollcall votes are expected tomorrow as the Senate works to complete action on the education bill this week.

I have been authorized to state on behalf of Senator DASCHLE that we are going to finish the education bill this week, if it takes working Friday, Saturday, and even into Sunday. We want to get started. We have very important things to do next week. This important legislation, which we have been able to approach on a bipartisan basis up to this point, is going to be completed, and Senator DASCHLE wanted me to underscore that.

---

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:42 p.m., adjourned until 9:30 a.m. Tuesday, June 12, 2001.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 12, 2001 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## JUNE 13

9:30 a.m.  
 Governmental Affairs  
 To hold hearings to examine economic issues associated with the restructuring of energy industries. SD-342

Appropriations  
 Defense Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings on the overview for fiscal year 2002 for the Army. SD-192

Indian Affairs  
 To hold hearings on the nomination of Neal A. McCaleb, of Oklahoma, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs. SR-485

Appropriations  
 Transportation Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings on on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for Coast Guard Readiness. SD-124

Armed Services  
 To hold a closed briefing to examine the Department of Defense's strategic review of missile defense. SD-222

10 a.m.  
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
 To hold hearings on the nomination of Roger Walton Ferguson, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. SD-538

Judiciary  
 Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings to examine racial and geographic disparities in the federal death penalty system. SD-226

10:15 a.m.  
 Foreign Relations  
 To hold hearings on the current situation in Macedonia and the Balkans. SD-419

10:30 a.m.  
 Appropriations  
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council of Environmental Quality. SD-138

## JUNE 14

9:30 a.m.  
 Governmental Affairs  
 Investigations Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings to examine the nature and scope of cross border fraud, focusing on the state of binational U.S.-Canadian law enforcement coordination and cooperation and what steps can be taken to fight such crime in the future. SD-342

Aging  
 To hold hearings to examine the prevalence and risk of elder abuse, neglect and exploitation, potential and available services and the role of the Federal Government in addressing these problems. SD-562

Energy and Natural Resources  
 To hold hearings to examine potential problems in the gasoline markets this summer. SD-106

10 a.m.  
 Veterans' Affairs  
 Business meeting to consider the nomination of Gordon H. Mansfield, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Congressional Affairs; to be followed by a hearing to examine the impact of the nursing shortage on the Department of Veteran Affairs. SR-418

2 p.m.  
 Appropriations  
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Health and Human Services. SD-138

## JUNE 15

9:30 a.m.  
 Governmental Affairs  
 Investigations Subcommittee  
 To continue hearings to examine the nature and scope of cross border fraud, focusing on the state of binational U.S.-Canadian law enforcement coordina-

tion and cooperation and what steps can be taken to fight such crime in the future. SD-342

## JUNE 19

9:30 a.m.  
 Energy and Natural Resources  
 To hold hearings on S. 764, to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to impose just and reasonable load-differentiated demand rates or cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market; and S. 597, to provide for a comprehensive and balanced national energy policy. SD-366

10 a.m.  
 Indian Affairs  
 To hold oversight hearings to receive the goals and priorities of the member tribes of the Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes/Inter-tribal Bison Cooperative for the 107th Congress.  
 Room to be announced  
 2:30 p.m.  
 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
 International Trade and Finance Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the United States Export-Import Bank. SD-538

## JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.  
 Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
 To hold hearings to examine local competition issues. SR-253

Governmental Affairs  
 To hold hearings to examine the role of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission associated with the restructuring of the energy industries. SD-342

10 a.m.  
 Appropriations  
 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee  
 To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. SD-138

10:15 a.m.  
 Foreign Relations  
 To hold hearings to examine United States security interests in Europe. SD-419

## JUNE 21

10 a.m.  
 Indian Affairs  
 To hold oversight hearings to examine Native American Program initiatives. SR-485

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
 To hold hearings to examine international trade issues. SR-253

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



JUNE 26		CANCELLATIONS	Demonstration Program and to examine efforts to extend or make the program permanent.
10:30 a.m.		JUNE 14	
Indian Affairs			SD-354
To hold oversight hearings to receive the goals and priorities of the Great Plains Tribes for the 107th Congress.	SR-485	2:30 p.m. Energy and Natural Resources National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee To hold oversight hearings to review the implementation of the Recreation Fee	